CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

VOL. XV   CONTENTS FOR JULY 1920   No. 3

FORERUNNERS OF THE ROMANCE ADVERBIAL SUFFIX

BY EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

A few years ago there appeared in *Classical Philology* (V, 83–96) an article by Professor Shorey called "A Greek Analogue of the Romance Adverb." In that paper he directed attention to the large number of dative phrases which are practically adverbial in their character. The most obvious illustrations are such word-groups as $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\grave{\iota}\ \tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\varphi = \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma$, $\pi o\acute{\iota}\varphi\ \tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\varphi = \pi\hat{\omega}\varsigma$. In like manner $\pi\nu\kappa\iota\nu\hat{\eta}\ \phi\rho\epsilon\nu\grave{\iota}$ corresponds to $\pi\nu\kappa\iota\nu\hat{\omega}\varsigma$, and $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\nu\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\varphi\ \phi\rho\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}$ to $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\nu\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$. Examples might be multiplied with such words as $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}, \pi o\delta\acute{\iota}, \tau\acute{\nu}\chi\eta, \mu\acute{o}\rho\varphi, \theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota, \sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota, \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\varphi, \beta\acute{\iota}\varphi, \sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\varphi$.

It is the purpose of the present monograph to parallel for Latin what Professor Shorey has done for Greek. Every classical and Romance scholar is well aware of the fact that the Latin ablative *mente* crystallized into the adverbial suffix *-mente* of the Italian and Spanish and *-ment* in French.

There were, however, many Latin words whose instrumental form acquired, or started to acquire, modal force, and which, so far as meaning is concerned, might have served equally well as adverbial suffixes. *Mente* was, in fact, a rather tardy competitor for the honor and had to elbow aside older contestants. Even in our Latin texts we find *opere* and *modis* attached to words in the fashion of suffixes.

The adverbial nature of certain ablatival phrases can be seen most readily in sentences in which they are employed in concinnity with pure adverbs: e.g., "me victitare pulchre, te miseris modis" (Plautus *Most.* 54; cf. "misere vivere," Plautus *Aul.* 315); "ego illam exemplis plurimis planeque amo" (Plautus *Bacch.* 505); "more hoc fit atque stulte" (Plautus *Stich.* 641); "auribus teneo lupum: nam neque *quo pacto* a me amittam neque *uti* retineam scio" (Ter. *Phor.* 506–7); "satis recte aut vera ratione augurem" (*Acc.* 87); "responsa dedere sanctius et multo certa ratione magis" (Lucr. 1. 738); "multimodis, temere, incassum frustraque coacta" (Lucr. 2. 1060); "non modo libenter, sed etiam aequo animo legere" (Cic. *Att.* xii. 4. 2); "magno animo et fortiter excellenterque gesta sunt" (Cic. *Off.* i. 18. 61); "aguntur leniter et mente tranquilla" (Cic. *Tusc.* iv. 25. 55); "quas difficultates patienter atque aequo animo ferebant" (Caes. *B.C.* iii. 15); "quo liberius ac minore periculo < =minus periculose> milites aquarentur" (Caes. *B.C.* iii. 66. 6); "muliebriter forsitan, sed fida mente" (Quint. *Curt.* viii. 3. 7).

Very frequently a phrasal ablative contains a word or idea cognate with that of the verb. The noun then becomes merely a mechanical device, a peg on which to suspend an idea, with approximately the force of an adverbial suffix: e.g., "quibus moratam moribus" (Ter. *Hec.* 644); "Blanda voce < =blande> vocabam" (Enn. ap. Cic. *Div.* i. 20. 41); "Rauco mihi dixerat ore" (Ov. *Met.* 5. 600); "Ille ducem haud timidis vadentem passibus[1] aequat" (*Aen.* 6. 263). "Sic . . . . locutus" (*Aen.* 5. 14; 303; 400) is synonymous with "Tali . . . . ore locutus" (*Aen.* 4. 276). Such ablatives express an adverbial idea in much the same fashion as an adverbial cognate accusative: e.g., "torva tuentem" (*Aen.* 6. 467); "magna sonaturum" (Hor. *Sat.* i. 4. 44); "dulce ridentem" (Hor. *Carm.* i. 22. 23). Such an accusative may, in fact, be used in concinnity with an adverb: e.g., "timide et pauca [i.e., briefly] dicamus" (Cic. *Leg. Man.* 16. 47).

When ablatival groups have crystallized into adverbial phrases, they are used with verbs to which they would not otherwise be strictly appropriate: e.g., "aequo *animo audire* non poteram" (Fronto *Ep. ad M. Caesarem* iv. 12); "Non possum *animo* aequo

---

[1] The writer construes *timidis passibus* with *vadentem*.

videre tot tam importunos, tam sceleratos hostis" (Cic. *Phil.* xii. 8. 20); "annos cum dat a me misero triste < = tristi > *ore ducendos*" (*CIL*, XIII, 1602); "Tu qui secura *procedis mente*" (*CIL*, VI, 12652).

The breast, heart, and mind were at one time or another regarded as seats of various aspects of our mental and emotional life.   In addition, the carriage and expression of the instrumental parts of the body reflect the feelings of the *pectus, cor*, and *mens*.[1]   It makes but little difference, therefore, whether a person acts or does things bravely (timidly, gladly, sadly, freely, mindfully, etc.), or with brave (timid, glad, sad, free, mindful, etc.) breast, heart, mind, mouth, foot, hand, and even voice and pace.

It may be stated by way of parenthesis that the writer cannot hope that all readers will agree with him (or with one another) as to the presence or absence of modal value in certain ablatives cited, nor does he himself exclude the possibility of an alternative interpretation at times.   In several examples quoted the construction of attendant circumstance or locative ablative will afford a convenient refuge for those disposed to argue the question.   The very fact, however, of the possibility of more than one interpretation, or of an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, shows that development was going on and is sufficient indication that words denoting the instrumental parts of the body were acquiring modal force and might have crystallized into the Romance adverbial suffix.[2] .The tendency is for the modifying adjective to stand out more and more clearly in relief while the noun recedes gradually into the background.   There is not so much room for difference of opinion with regard to the more general words denoting method, manner, agreement (*modo, more, pacto*), etc.

In the first three captions following it will be noticed that *pectus, cor*, and *mens*[3] are each modified by *pius, purus*, and *totus*.   This shows how colorless and interchangeable these words became.

[1] See E. S. McCartney, "Some Folk-Lore of Ancient Anatomy and Physiology," *Class. Weekly*, XII, 18–21; 26–29; 35–38.

[2] The adverbs, as far as we can trace their origin, are almost exclusively the outcome of crystallized cases of nouns, and to some extent of the combination of a preposition with its case (Paul, *Principles of Language* [Strong], p. 422).

[3] In the case of *mens* the expressions are in the note.

NON-INSTRUMENTAL PARTS OF THE BODY

PECTUS

"Pectore qui vixit semper puroque pioque" (Eng., p. 103);[1] "Te
. . . . iam pectore toto < =whole-heartedly> accipio" (*Aen.* 9. 275–
77); "Nam quamvis memori referas mihi pectore cuncta" (Hor. *Ser.*
ii. 4. 90: cf. "ad Maecenatem memori si mente recurras," Hor.
Sat. ii. 6. 31); "forti sequemur pectore" (Hor. *Epod.* 1. 14);
"Liquerit immemori discedens pectore coniunx" (Catull. 64. 123);
"nimium, Alcide, pectore forti properas maestos visere manes" (Sen.
Herc. Fur. 186–87); qui se hominem meminit, securo pectore vivat"
(*CIL*, VI, 17104); "Quis illaec est mulier timido pectore peregre
adveniens?" (Plautus *Epid.* 533); "pectore sancto < =reverently>
non monimenta patri, sed nova templa dedit" (Chol., 878*b*).   In the
next sentence *toto pectore* seems to modify *dives* and to mean
"entirely": "set securus eris, set toto pectore dives" (Chol., 878).
Toto pectore can hardly be specification.

Uber, when synonymous with *pectus*, seems to be used in the same
way:

> Dardanidae duri, quae vos a stirpe parentum
> Prima tulit tellus, eadem vos ubere laeto < =laete?>[2]
> Accipiet reduces (*Aen.* iii. 94–96).

COR

"Quaerite corde pio caelum" (Eng., p. 119); "Salvete fratres
puro corde et simplici" ("Greet your brothers purely and simply"
[Anthol., 115]); "O penitus toto corde[3] recepte mihi" (Ov. *Ep.*
19. 156); "Utinam ne Colchis cupido corde pedem extulisses" (*Enn.*
1. 241, Ribbeck); "(Hoc auferam) lubentissimo corde atque animo"
(Plautus *Pseud.* 1321).

MENTE[4]

Mente was slow in getting a start toward adverbial usage, but it
gathered momentum in course of time: "ille traversa mente mi

---

[1] The following arbitrary abbreviations are used in this paper: Eng. =Engström,
Carmina Latina Epigraphica; Chol. =Cholodniak, *Carmina Sepulcralia Latina;*
Anthol. =Buecheler, *Carmina Latina Epigraphica.*

[2] Perhaps *ubere laeto* has both modal and instrumental force.

[3] In this expression the locative idea may be in relief if *toto corde* more accurately
defines *penitus.*

[4] Cf. φρενί, Shorey, pp. 85–87.

hodie tradidit repagula" (Frag. 269 Sc. Vahlen); "aguntur <ista>
leniter et mente tranquilla" (Cic. *Tusc.* iv. 25. 55); "ut numquam
liceat quieta mente consistere" (Cic. *Div.* ii. 72. 149); "furiata
mente ferebar" (Verg. *Aen.* 2. 588); "Sed quali solam Theseus me
mente reliquit, Tali mente, deae, funestet seque suosque" (Catull.
64. 200–201); "insana mente nefanda loqui" (Tibull. ii. 6. 18);
"turbata mente respondit" (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 22. 3); "peccas honesta
mente" (Sen. *Phoen.* 97); "ut verba natae mente placata audias"
(Sen. *Phoen.* 183); "secura procedis mente" (Chol., 93); "munera
parva quidem, sed data mente pia" (Eng., 298).

This use of the ablative *mente* is so important as the forerunner
of the Romance adverbial suffix that additional illustrations are
given in the notes.[1]   Still others may be found in Professor Shorey's
article.

ANIMO

The adverbial use of *animo* is extremely common in the days of
Cicero and Caesar, but it is worth noting that the usage was already

[1] "particulas . . . . in ordinem adductas mente divina" (Cic. *Ac.* ii. 37. 118);
"tota mente mater de pernicie fili cogitaret" (Cic. *Cluent.* 66. 190); "quos tu impia
mente conquiris" (Cic. *Har. Resp.* 13. 26); "ad Maecenatem memori si mente
recurras" (Hor. *Sat.* ii. 6. 31); "sensit enim simulata mente locutam" (*Aen.* 4. 105);
"hac . . . . mente tradit" (Nep. *Dion.* 9. 1); "tacita mente rogat" (Tibull. ii. 6. 16);
"sagaci mente" (Lucr. 1. 1022; 5. 420); "conlecta mente reverti" (Lucr. 2. 961);
"divina mente coorta" (Lucr. 3. 15); "memori repraehendere mente" (Lucr. 3. 859);
"pacata mente tueri" (Lucr. 5. 1203); "ea mente acturam ut . . . . " (Tac. *Ann.* iv.
40. 16); "mente turbata feror" (Sen. *Oct.* 713); "Acheron profundum mente non
aequa tulit" (Sen. *Oed.* 578); "sed uterque letum mente generosa tulit" (Sen. *Tro.*
1064); "incerta vaecors mente vaesana feror" (Sen. *Med.* 123); "ego ignoro ea te
mente Alsium isse" (Fronto, p. 224, Naber); "improvida mente" (Eugippus 5. 3);
"secura mente occidit" (Chol., 792); "mente dedere pia" (Chol., 601); "militiae
studiis secura mente vacavi" (Anthol., 1429); "quem pura mente parentes
optabant" (Anthol., 770).

Some of the Romance descendants of the Latin expressions are given in the table
below:

LATIN	FRENCH	SPANISH	ITALIAN
tranquilla mente	tranquillement	tranquilamente	tranquillamente
honesta mente	honnêtement	honestamente	onestamente
secura mente	sûrement	seguramente	sicuramente
divina mente	divinement	divinamente	divinamente
tota mente	totalement	totalmente	totalmente
conlecta mente	collectivement	colectivamente	collettivamente
generosa mente	généreusement	generosamente	generosamente
pia mente	pieusement	piadosamente	piamente
pura mente	purement	puramente	puramente
aequa mente	également	igualmente	ugualmente
tacita mente	tacitement	tacitamente	tacitamente

well established in Plautus: e.g., "oratum advenio ut animo aequo ignoscas mihi" (*Aul.* 739); "si quid fecero, clementi animo ignoscet" (*Mil.* 1252); "iubet bono ut animo sedeant in subselliis" (*Poen.* 5); "lubenti edepol animo factum et fiet a me" (*Cist.* 12).[1]

As was the case with *pectus*, *cor*, and *mens*, the adjective *pius* may be used with *animo:* e.g., "corde animoque pio posuit donaria Victor" (Chol., 63). Other examples are: "uno animo omnes socrus oderunt nurus" (Ter. *Hec.* 201); "scripsi sedatiore animo" (Cic. *Att.* viii. 3. 7); "aequo animo paratoque moriar" (Cic. *Cat.* iv. 2. 3); "se . . . . subiturum eam tempestatem forti animo" (Liv. iv. 44. 9); "simplici animo vivens" (Chol., 880c).

In later Latin the root *anim-+iter* started to develop into an adverbial suffix (e.g., *aequanimiter*, *unanimiter*), but met too much opposition.

INSTRUMENTAL PARTS OF THE BODY

The instrumental parts of the body are used at times in constructions very similar to those just discussed. It is possible, however, to explain the usage in a slightly different way. As stated before, the lips, hands, and feet, for instance, by their carriage or expression very often reflect the state of mind and hence have applied to them adjectives that are strictly appropriate only for the *mens*. In many cases, however, so much emphasis falls on the adjective that the noun is colorless.

ORE

Memor and *pius*, which were used with nouns of the first group, may likewise modify *os:* "Auditos memori ore sonos" (Ov. *Ars Am.* 3. 700); "pio si poenas ore reposco" (Verg. *Aen.* 6. 530). Other examples are "Auditis ille haec placido sic reddidit ore" (*Aen.* 11. 251); "Quodque deus vero Cynthius ore feram" (Tibull. iii. 4. 50). In these expressions the instrumental idea cannot, perhaps, be excluded, but "Blando . . . . ore locutus" (Val. Flacc. 8. 36) does not differ in thought from "blande adloqui" (Plautus *Truc.* 225). The similarity of "Sic locutus" and "Tali ore locutus" has already been noted.

---

[1] See Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*, *s.v.*, *animus*. See also Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin, The Cases*, p. 307; Hidén, *De Casuum Syntaxi Lucretiana*, Fuegner, *Lexicon Livianum*, *s.v.*, *animus*.

VOCE

Voce is employed in the same manner as *ore:* e.g., "blanda voce vocabam" (Enn. ap. Cic. *Div.* i. 20. 41); "tristi . . . . voce locutus" (Ov. *Met.* 7. 517); "tacita quoque carmina voce dixit" (Ov. *Met.* 9. 300); "voce blandiloqua dictus" (Sen. *Ag.* 290). "Tali compellat voce" (Lucan. *Phars.* 9. 226) has the same force as "sic conpellat" (Enn. *Ann.* 251, Vahlen). With the second quotation from Ovid, compare "tacita mente rogat" (Tibull. iv. 6. 16).

LINGUA

In a line of *Naevius* (*Com. Rel.* 112, Ribbeck), the word *lingua* is due chiefly to the desire for alliteration: "Libera lingua loquemur ludis Liberalibus"; but compare "libero ore locutus" (Sall. *Jug.* 95. 2); "corde libero fabulare" (Plautus *Epid.* 146); "loquar libere" (Plautus *Truc.* 212).

MANU[1]

The ablative *manu* is used very freely in Latin, yet it is hard to find examples which must be regarded as purely modal. In the next two quotations *nox* and *amnis* are probably personified, thus making the ablatives instrumental: "bellum aequis manibus nox intempestata diremit" (Enn. *Ann.* 167, Vahlen); "manu magna Romanos impulit amnis" (Enn. *Ann.* 569, Vahlen).

Manu is modified, especially in Seneca, by many adjectives denoting qualities or states of mind. It is clear that the adjective carries the principal idea, but the instrumental force of *manu* is not entirely obliterated: "complexus aras ille tremibunda manu" (Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 810); "luctifica manu vastam rogo flagrante corripiat trabem" (Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 102–3). Compare other uses in Seneca: "feroci manu" (*Herc. Oet.* 373); "saeva manu" (*Herc. Oet.* 429, 522); "trepida manu" (*Herc. Fur.* 341; *Herc. Oet.* 654, 768–69); "manu trementi" (*Ag.* 380–81); "facili manu" (*Oct.* 483); "incesta manu" (*Oct.* 854); "funesta manu" (*Oct.* 954); "enthea manu" (*Oed.* 628); "avaris manibus" (*Oct.* 435).

In a passage in Horace (*Carm.* iii. 16. 43–44), *parca manu* is virtually *parce:* "bene est cui deus obtulit parca quod satis est manu." In the next quotation "languida manu" seems to have full modal force, since one does not ordinarily govern by the hand: "qui vult amari, languida regnat manu" (Sen. *Phoen.* 659).

[1]Cf. χε[ι]ρί, Shorey, p. 90.

Things may be done *grata manu:* e.g., "Hoc tumolo cineres atque ossa novissima coniux Terpsichore grata condidit ipse manu" (Chol., 70), or *grata mente:* e.g., "haec inter nos grata mente facientes" (Cassiodorus *Varia* v. 1. 3).

There are, however, *manu* phrases in which the adverbial character is quite clear. In one instance Cicero uses such a phrase in concinnity with pure adverbs: "At hercule alter tuus familiaris Hortalus quam plena manu [i.e., generously], quam ingenue, quam ornate nostra laudes in astra sustulit, cum de praetura et de illo tempore Allobrogum diceret" (*Att.* ii. 25. 1). *Plena manu* in the sense of abundantly, generously, is used on several occasions by Seneca (*Ben.* i. 7. 2; *Ep.* 120. 10; *Ad Polyb.* 9. 7). *Utraque manu* means "willingly," "readily," in one passage in *Martial:* "Haec utraque manu complexusque assere toto" (i. 15. 9). Such adverbial usage reached the height of its development in expressions like *longa manu,* "slowly," "tediously" (*Dig.* xlvi. 3. 79), and *brevi manu,* "immediately" (*Dig.* xxiii. 3. 43, §1).

In most of the examples cited with *manu,* qualities of the mind or heart are transferred to the hand. In the last two instances, however, the *manu* has become about as colorless as the adverbial suffix *-ly* in English.

<center>PEDE[1]</center>

As was the case with *manus,* Seneca transfers states or qualities of mind to *pes* much more freely than earlier writers: "Nec qui superbo miserias calcem pede" (*Med.* 253); "funesto pede intravit aulam" (*Oct.* 161–62); "templa Phoebi supplici intravi pede" (*Oed.* 225). The plural is employed in the same way: "qui pedibus rectis graditur, mala nulla veretur" (Corippus *in Laudem Justini* 2. 227). These ablatives are used with verbs of motion, and one is inclined to regard them as means, yet *modo* would have done as well: cf. "medium subit illa per agmen, non humili festina modo" (Stat. *Theb.* 4. 798–99).

A superstition gives rise to an interesting adverbial usage: "Quid tam dextro pede concipis, ut te conatus non paeniteat votique peracti" (Juv. 10. 5); "cessisse parentibus omne Idalium semper feliciter et pede dextro" (Prudent. *Symm.* ii. 78–79).

[1]Cf. ποδί, Shorey, p. 90.

One may walk with timid foot, "timido pede percitus vadit" (Lucil. 795, Marx), or with timid breast, "mulier timido pectore peregre adveniens" (Plautus *Epid.* 533). One may proceed with quick foot as well as quickly: "Tu pede qui stricto vadis per semita" (Anthol. 434). The very fact that the singular *pede* instead of *pedibus* is used here shows that the instrumental force is not predominant.

The subjects are probably personified in the following quotations: "liquido pede labitur unda" (Verg. *Cul.* 17; cf. "liquida mente vidit," Catull. 63. 46); "levis crepante lympha desilit pede" (Hor. *Ep.* 16. 48); compare "from standing lake to tripping ebb, that stole with soft foot toward the deep" (Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book XI, l. 847).

A fine instance of personification occurs in Horace's *Odes* (i. 4. 13–14): "Pallida mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas Regumque turris."[1] The Shorey-Laing edition of Horace parallels this by a passage written under its influence: "Pale death with equal foot strikes wide the door | Of royal halls and hovels of the poor."[2]

GRADU, GRESSU, PASSU

Gradu, gressu, and *passu* are not much different from *pede*, since to them, too, mental states and qualities are attributed: "agite exulem funesto gradu" (Sen. *Oed.* 648); "ut profugus urbem liquit infesto gradu" (Sen. *Phaed.* 1000); "sublimi gradu incedit Ithacus" (Sen. *Tro.* 1088–89); "gradu segni pergit" (*Tro.* 1090–91); "perge non dubio gradu" (Sen. *Thy.* 490); "pavitante gressu sequere" (Sen. *Oed.* 1047); "gressu ruit attonito" (Sen. *Oct.* 778). Compare "We shall go down with unreluctant tread, Rose-crowned into the darkness" (Rupert Brooke, *The Hill*); "Fate steals along with silent tread" (Cowper, *A Fable*, l. 36).

A person may move with hasty *pede, gradu, gressu, passu,* or hastily: "celeri pede laberis" (Sen. *Phaed.* 763); "repetite celeri maria, captivae, gradu" (Sen. *Tro.* 1178); "propero regiam gressu

---

[1] Cf. also "Iam veniet tacito curva senecta pede" (Ov *Ars. Amat.* 2. 670); "Nec venit tardo curva senecta pede" (Tibull. iii. 5. 16); "Non tardo labitur illa (aetas) pede" (Tibull. i. 8. 48); "Sera tamen tacitis poena venit pedibus" (Tibull. i. 9. 4).

[2] Cowper, *Yearly Bill of Mortality,* 1787.

pete" (Sen. *Oed.* 880); cf. "propere properare" (Plautus *Curc.* 535; 688; *Aul.* 393); "hinc campum celeri passu permensa" (Enn. *ap. Non.* 37. 8); "huc propere admove" (Sen. *Oed.* 334).

How far such expressions may depart from their original meaning is shown by the use of *gradus* to denote verbal pace: "Ecce praecipiti gradu secreta mentis ore confuso exerit" (Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 254–55).

Cursu is used at times much like *gradu:* e.g., "ut tigris orba natis cursu furente lustrat Gangeticum nemus" (Sen. *Med.* 863–65). It is, of course, possible to construe *cursu furente* as a locative, but it seems analogous to "furiata mente ferebar" (*Aen.* 2. 588).

Several interesting uses occur with *aure:* "missasque voces *aure sollicita* excipit" (Sen. *Tro.* 617): cf. "id sacrum nec *sollicita* nec profana *mente* debebis opperiri" (Ap. *Met.* xi. 5. 27); "parumper *aure* verba *patienti* excipe" (Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 361): cf. "gravia quisquis vulnera *patiente* et aequo mutus *animo* pertulit" (Sen. *Med.* 151–52); "Barbaricos *docili concipit* aure sonos" (Claudian *Carm. Min.* 22 [51]. 8, Jeep); "voces aure non timida hauriam" (Sen. *Oed.* 385).

A few uses of *voltu* are sufficiently close to adverbial usage to merit quotation: "qui eo voltu <almost=ita> nos intuetur ut sibi ipse peracutus esse videatur" (Cic. *Verr.* ii. 44. 108); "Viden tu hunc quam inimico< =inimice>voltu intuitur" (Plautus *Capt.* 557); "Sed en citato Pyrrhus accurrit gradu vultuque torvo" (Sen. *Tro.* 999–1000).[1]   In the last quotation, if *vultu torvo* does not denote attendant circumstance, it almost certainly equals *torve*, since one cannot approach by means of a fierce visage.

ABSTRACT WORDS DENOTING METHOD, MANNER, ETC.

In addition to the group of words denoting a part of the body, there is another rather large class composed of abstract words denoting method, manner, agreement, plan, etc. In this category the adverbial usage is much clearer.

MODO[2]

Through wear and tear the instrumental *modo*, "by method," very early acquired a modal force, so that *hoc modo=sic*, just as τόνδε τὸν τρόπον=οὕτως. *Modo* is used in adverbial phrases more

[1] Cf. also "Sed quotiens bonus atque fidus | Iudex honestum praetulit utili | Reiecit alto dona nocentium | Voltu" (Hor. *Carm.* iv. 9. 40–43).   Here *alto vultu* approximates *superbe.*

[2] Cf. τρόπῳ, Shorey, p. 89.

frequently than any other word.   Even the plural becomes adverbial:
"Deludificatust me hodie indignis modis" (Plautus *Most.* 1033);
"omnibu' modis temptare" (Plautus *Stich.* 684); "caecis verba
nectentem modis" (Sen. *Oed.* 92; cf. *Phoen.* 132).   The adverbial
nature of such expressions becomes so pronounced that finally they
modify even adjectives: "mira miris modis" (Plautus *Cas.* 625);
"multis modis fidus" (Plautus *Most.* 785); "multis modis enormis"
(*Quint.* xi. 3. 139); "ora modis . . . . pallida miris" (*Aen.* 1.
354); "Simulacra modis pallentia miris" (Verg. *Georg.* 1. 477).[1]

When the *s* of the modifying adjectives wore off ("saepe brevi-
tatis causa contrahebant ut ita dicerent multi' modis" [Cic. *Orat.*
153]), *multimodis, mirimodis,* and along with them, *omnimodo* became
full-fledged adverbial compounds analogous in formation to the
adjectives *multigenis, multiplex:* e.g., "Nomen multimodis scrip-
tumst tuom" (Plautus *Pers.* 706); "mirimodis mirabilis" (Plautus
Trin. 931).   *Omnimodo* occurs for instance in Gellius xviii. 15. 2.
Omnimodis, which was formed by false analogy, is said by Harpers'
Dictionary to be only Lucretian and late Latin.   It occurs in Lucre-
tius 1. 683; 2. 489; 3. 406; 5. 1024, etc.   *Quo* and *modo* are at times
written as one word.

Some accusative adverbial phrases may be noted in passing:
"perpetuom in modum" (Plaut. *Most.* iii. 1. 5); "servilem in modum"
(Cic. *Verr.* i. 5. 13); "mirum in modum" (Caes. *B.G.* 1. 41); "hos-
tilem in modum" (Liv. i. 5. 4; cf. "hostili modo," Auct. *B. Alex.* 59);
"foedum in modum" (Liv. xxiii. 7. 3).

<div align="center">EXEMPLO</div>

The word *exemplum* comes from *eximere,* "to take out," i.e., as
a sample, pattern, or model: e.g., "Quisquis amat coniunx, hoc
exsemplo coniungat amorem" (Chol., 192); "si istoc exemplo omnibus
qui quaerunt, respondebis" (Plautus *As.* 389).   In Plautus the word
is used very frequently of punishments that make "examples" of
their victims, but it is found with verbs other than those of punishing
and amounts to little more than an adverbial suffix: e.g., "di deaeque
me omnes pessumis exemplis interficiant" (*Most.* 192; cf. *Capt.*

---

[1] Cf. also "Edidit haec dulci tristia verba modo" (Tibull. iii. 4. 42); "Utrumque
nostrum incredibili modo consentit astrum" (Hor. *Carm.* ii. 17. 21–22); "Tu semper
urges flebilibus modis Mysten ademptum" (Hor. *Carm.* ii. 9. 9–10).

691); "Perii hercle, ni ego illam pessumis exemplis enicasso" (*Most.*
212); "hoc opto, moriare malis exemplis cruciatus et ipse" (*Eng.*,
p. 43); "exemploque pari furit omnis turba" (Ov. *Met.* 3. 122). *Quis
exemplis* differs but very little from *ut*, "how:" "Narravero quis
med exemplis hodie eludificatus est" (*Most.* 1040–41).

It can thus be seen how *exemplis* became synonymous with
modis: "quot amans exemplis ludificetur, quot modis pereat"
(Plautus *Truc.* 26–27); "Miris modis di ludos faciunt hominibus,
Mirisque exemplis somnia in somnis danunt" (Plautus *Rud.* 593–94).

<div align="center">PACTO</div>

Pacto, "by agreement," finally wears down until it becomes in
some of its uses a synonym of *modo*, and relieves it of some of its
burden: "alio pacto < =aliter> haud poterat fieri" (Ter. *And.* 792);
"Nunc certa res est, eodem pacto < =ita> ut comici servi solent,
coniciam" (Plautus *Capt.* 778–79); "Servi mehercule mei si me isto
pacto metuerent, ut te metuunt omnes cives tui" (Cic. *Cat.* i. 7. 17).[1]
Nescio quo pacto is an alternative for *nescio quo modo.*

Quo pacto is frequently used by Lucretius. Merrill, commenting
on l. 84, says it is a phrase half antique, half poetic. It is, how-
ever, common in Cicero, as reference to Merguet will show.

<div align="center">GENERE</div>

Even the ablative *genere* is used in the adverbial construction.
In all probability it was so employed under the influence of *modo*,
of which it is a synonym in some of its uses: e.g., "cum maesti
deliberaremus quonam genere praesentem evitaremus procellam"
(Petr. 26. 8); "sed nullo genere par erat causa" (Petr. 14. 7); "quo
genere accipienti maxime profuturum erit" (Sen. *Ben.* ii. 10. 2);
"armare se coepit multis generibus" (Sen. *Epist. Mor.* 95. 29).

<div align="center">OPERE</div>

The adverbial use of *opere* seems to be limited to adjectives
denoting degree. It prevented the regular formation of adverbs
from the adjectives *tantus* and *quantus*, and stunted the growth of
magne[2] and *summe*.

---

[1] See also Ebrard, p. 592; Bennett, *op. cit.*, pp. 309–10.

[2] *Magna ex parte* might have competed with *magno opere* as a substitute for
magne had not the latter form been assisted by *tanto opere*, etc.

With *magno*, *tanto*, and *maximo*, it is common in Plautus in connection with verbs of requesting and beseeching: "vos omnis opere magno esse oratos volo" (Cas. *Prol.* 21); "opere oravit maximo" (Mil. *Glor.* 75); "tanto opere orabat" (*Cas.* 531). A few other words are used in this construction: "nimio opere delectant" (Cic. *Parad.* 36); "quanto se opere custodiant bestiae" (Cic. *Nat.* 2. 726); "ille eo maiore hinc opere ex te exemplum petit" (Plautus *Most.* 763); "omnia summo opere hos vitae postscaenia celant" (Lucr. 4. 1186).

With some of these words *opere* is really at times an adverbial suffix: "Vitia vero haec sunt quae *summopere* vitare oportebit" (Cic. *Inv.* i. 18. 26); "neque enim *tantopere* hanc a Crasso disputationem desideratam, *quantopere*[1] eius in causis oratione delector" (Cic. *De orat.* i. 35. 164); "cur pecuniam *magnopere* desideret" (Cic. *Tusc.* 5. 89). Harpers' *Dictionary* says that *magnopere* is "so written by Plaut., Caes., Livy and Sen., but ap. Ter., Cic., Plin., H.N., the best MSS. and edd. have magno opere."

How far such expressions have strayed from their original instrumental force is shown by their ability to modify an adjective: "quod mobile tanto operest" (Lucr. 3. 186).

OPERA

Perhaps under the influence of *opere*, *opera* began to develop along the same lines: "una opera mihi sunt sodales qua iste" (Plautus *Capt.* 562–63); "Pol qua opera credam tibi, una opera adligem fugitivam canem" (Plautus *Pseud.* 318–19); "Una opera (me) in furnum calidum condito, qua opera impetres" (Plautus *Cas.* 309); "una opera . . . . postules" (Plautus *Most.* 259); "iubeas una opera me piscari in aëre" (Plautus *As.* 99). Compare Livy's use of *ope:* "rem summa ope taceri iubent" (i. 56. 11).

RATIONE

Ratione, "by plan," is used in this construction more frequently by Lucretius, perhaps, than by any other writer: "Nec ratione alia < =aliter> volucres . . . . subsidere possent" (4. 1197–98); "Et ne cetera consimili ratione < =likewise >sequantur" (1. 1104); "errantes caeca ratione feruntur" (6. 67); "quam facili et celeri ratione genantur" (4. 143).[2]

[1] Some texts do, however, write *quanto opere*.
[2] See Hidén, *op. cit.*, pp. 40–43.

More (moribus)

More, too, becomes a partial synonym of *modo:* "maritumis moribu' mecum expetitur" (Plautus *Cist.* 221); "nisi forte tu perverso more . . . . huic eripere" (Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 56); "quae (casae) more Gallico stramentis erant tectae" (Caes. *B.G.* v. 43. 1); "inaudito more . . . . unxerunt" (Petr. 70. 8); "legitimo more sepulta (ossa) fove" (*CIL*, VI, 6319). A cognate ablative is seen in the following: "quibus moratam moribus"< =quam moratam > (Ter. *Hec.* 644); cf. "perversa mente moratus" (Commodianus *Instr.* i. 26. 24).

Vice (vicibus)

Both *vice* and *vicibus* are used adverbially: "fervet semper fluctus alterna vice" (Sen. *Ag.* 561; cf. *Thy.* 25; *Phaed.* 441); "Fortuna varia dubia quos agitat vice" (Sen. *Med.* 287); "mutua vice sustinetur et sustinet" (*Col.* iv. 16. 4); "versa vice" (Sen. *Herc. Oet.*470; cf. *Dig.* xliii. 29. 3); "aeterna vice" (Sen. *Oct.* 233); "vicissim Cato de consulatu suo qui 'maximis vicibus' inquit 'ac vicissim'" (Charis., Keil. 1, p. 224); "vicibus alternis" (Sen. *Oed.* 689; *Phaed.* 1028).

Via

Via, used figuratively, may have much the same force as *modo:* "qua via istuc facies" (Ter. *Phor.* 566); "nec alia via< =otherwise> magis in κακοζηλίαν itur" (Quint. viii. 6. 73). The adverbial use of *via* was so clear that finally its adjective alone became an adverb: "recta < =recta via> perge in exsilium" (Cic. *Cat.* i. 9. 23).

Vi[1]

Several uses of *vi* are listed as adverbial by Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin, The Cases*, p. 311: "vadunt solida vi" (Enn. Ann. 273); "vi summa rapiebat domum" (Plautus *Merc.* 45); "detrusus tota vi deiectusque Italia" (Lucil. 825 Marx).

Lucretius, too, uses the construction: "non temere ulla vi < =ullo modo> convinci posse putabant" (5. 1178). *Qua vi* is apparently used with the force of *quo modo*, although its exact meaning is at times hard to determine: e.g., "quo pacto fiant et qua vi quaeque gerantur" (Lucr. 1. 568; cf. 2. 549; 5. 77; 6. 380). In the following sentence *summa vi* seems to approximate *summo opere:* "Reditum inde Romam, ubi adversus Rutulos bellum summa vi parabatur" (Liv. i. 56. 13).

[1] Cf. μένει and σθένει, Shorey, p. 91.

FATO, MORTE, CLADE, FUNERE[1]

Professor Shorey lists a group composed of words for death, doom, fate, etc.   In Latin one hesitates to stress the modal character of such expressions, yet the writer is quoting a few which may be compared with Professor Shorey's citations from the Greek.   The chief idea is, however, clearly in the adjective, since we find the same adjective used with *mors, fatum,* and *funus.*   The selection of the noun is a question of meter rather than of sense: e.g., "vivere qui debent, fato moriuntur acerbo" (Chol., 642): "acerbo funere lapsus" (Chol., 351); "ego morte acerba peri" (Chol., 1157); "ambo per invidiam crudeli funere rapti" (Chol., 408); "una dies adimit crudeli clade peremtas" (Chol., 258); "miserando funere rapti" (Chol., 1001).

FIDE

Fide, a word of a far different character, is used at times in a manner suggesting *mente:* e.g., "Accipe qui pura norit amare fide" (Ov. *Am.* i. 3. 6; cf. "Quem pura mente parentes optabant" [Anthol. 770]).[2]   *Fide* is employed much more freely in this way by Seneca: e.g., "quidquid amari apparo | Penitus recondas et fide tacita premas" (Herc. *Oet.* 476–77; cf. "tacita mente rogat" [Tibull. iv. 6. 16]); "Quos iam tenet Poppaea concordi fide?" (*Oct.* 791); "sceptra casta vidua tutari fide" (*Ag.* 111); "tibi muta fide longas Eleusin tacita iactabit faces" (Herc. *Fur.* 301); "casta fide servans torum natosque magnanimi Herculis" (Herc. *Fur.* 309). Perhaps this usage was chiefly colloquial.   At all events it is common in inscriptions: e.g., "quaque fide vixit, mors fuit indicium" (*CIL,* VI, 25570); "una fide coluit" (*CIL,* VI, 25427); "casta fide semper toru maritale dilexit" (*CIL,* VI, 12853).

ITER

The suffix *-iter* or *-ter,* which used to be regarded by some authorities as the accusative of the noun *iter* (hence *breviter,* "short-wise," cf. *kurz-weg:* see Lindsay, *Latin Language,* p. 549), might readily

---

[1] Cf. Shorey, p. 91.

[2] In the following quotation (Tibull. ii. 3. 61–62) *nulla fide* almost equals "in no wise":

"At tibi dura seges Nemesim qui abducis ab urbe,
Persolvat nulla semina certa fide."

have provided the Romance languages with an adverbial suffix. It made great inroads on the domains of the suffix *-e:* e.g., *duriter, largiter, humaniter, firmiter, insaniter, severiter, avariter, saeviter, maestiter, puriter, miseriter,* etc.[1] Even *faciliter* is used by Vitruvius (1. 43 *et passim*), a form which is censured by Quintilian (i. 6. 17).

how in latin

By some strange anomaly the Latin never developed for general use a short handy word for *how.* (The ablative *qui* and the interrogative use of *ut* are comparatively rare.) As a consequence it had to use two words for the idea. Besides the common *quo modo* and *quo pacto,* we find other ways of saying how: e.g., "*Quo . . . . more* de capite civis indemnati tulisti?" (Cic. *Dom.* 16. 43); "*quibus moribus* moratam" (Ter. *Hec.* 644); "indutiarum autem vocabulum qua *sit ratione* factum, iam diu est cum quaerimus" (Gell. *Noct. Att.* i. 25. 12); "*Qua mente . . . .* profectae" (Cic. *Fam.* xii. 15. 4); "*Qua via* istuc facies?" (Ter. *Phor.* 566).

Qua vi seems to be used with about the same force in Lucretius: "Hoc est igniferi naturam fulminis ipsam Perspicere et *qua vi* faciat rem quamque videre" (6. 379–80; cf. 1. 129, 568; 5. 77). Instances of *qua opera* and *quo genere* have already been given.

The Latin did not have enough adverbs to meet all requirements. As a substitute the ablative of manner was used. With the development of this construction, there was an increasing tendency to make of the nouns pegs on which to suspend the main ideas. The peg thus became a mere mechanical device and it was immaterial whether the peg was the word for a part of the body or some abstract word denoting method, manner, agreement, etc.

With the parts of the body the explanation of this usage is not to be found in syntax so much as in popular beliefs and folklore. Many aspects of our physical, mental, and emotional life had their seats falsely attributed to the *pectus, cor, mens,* or *animus.* Hence one did things with such and such a breast, heart, mind, or soul. In addition the instrumental parts of the body very readily reflect

---

[1] See Prisc. 1010 P; Non. 510–17. See also Ellis on Catullus 39. 14; Munro on Lucretius 1. 525; Knapp, "Archaism in Aulus Gellius," *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler,* pp. 167–68.

the mental state. It must be remembered that the Romans made more frequent use of gestures than we do and were more given to facial expression. Gradually, however, as the function of the *mens* came to be better understood, more and more qualities were ascribed to it. Finally adjectives other than those denoting qualities of mind were applied to it and it thus became a full-fledged adverbial suffix.

It is perhaps impossible to account for the ascendancy of *mente* over the ablatives *modo, pacto, exemplo*, etc., but the question of sound may have had some influence. The liquids in *mente* enable it to impart a certain swing or rhythm to Italian adverbs. One cannot imagine an adverbial suffix which could come more trippingly off the lips than does -*mente* in the Italian.

EVANSVILLE COLLEGE
    EVANSVILLE, IND.

VERGIL'S APPRENTICESHIP. III

By Tenney Frank

VERGIL'S THEORY OF HIS ART

If the arguments in the preceding papers are valid, we may
safely, with Suetonius, assign to Vergil at least the *Culex*, the *Ciris*,
and all of the *Catalepton*, and consequently reconstruct the history
of the poet's artistic development from these. In the last study I
attempted to collect whatever biographical material was available
in them; I wish now to consider in more detail the poet's theory of
his art as disclosed by his youthful work.

Vergil's earliest judgment regarding his own verse is the line in
which he describes the style of the *Culex* (48 B.C.). This (l. 35), he
says, is not heroic verse:

> mollia sed tenui pede currere carmina, versu
> viribus apta suis Phoebo duce ludere gaudet.[1]

In the *Ciris*, the prologue of which was written some five years
later, he characterizes that poem, and presumably all the poetry he
had thus far written, in similar terms (l. 20):

> quamvis interdum ludere nobis
> et gracilem molli liceat pede claudere versum.[2]

Phrases like *tenui pede* and *gracilem* are obviously suitable in
assigning a poem to the third of the three time-honored divisions,
the "plain" style; and Jackson (*Harvard Studies*, XXV, 117 ff.)
accordingly concludes that the poet referred his early work to this
type. The classification of styles into the three χαρακτῆρες, the
grand (μεγαλοπρεπές, *sublime*, *grande*, *grave*, etc.), the middle
(μέσον, *medium*), and the plain (ἰσχνόν, *tenue*, *subtile*, *gracile*, etc.),
was, of course, the orthodox procedure in the days of the Auctor ad
Herennium, Varro, and Cicero.

I venture to believe, however, that Vergil in using the words
molle and *ludere* had particularly in mind the third type in the four-
fold classification of styles: grand (μεγαλοπρεπές), plain (ἰσχνόν),

---

[1] Cf. i. 1, *gracili modulante Thalia.*

[2] In *Catalepton* ix. 61 he seems to refer to the *Ciris* as an approach to *humilis Cyrenas*. In the same poem he speaks of Messalla's eclogues as written *molliter* (l. 17).

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY XV, July, 1920]   230

polished (γλαφυρόν), and forceful (δεινόν), which is given by Demetrius, *De elocutione* 36, and that he would consider the γλαφυρόν (sometimes treated as a subtype of the *tenue*) as more nearly satisfying his ideals than the Stoic ἰσχνόν.[1]

Jackson (*loc. cit.*) has seen that Horace's description of Vergil's early work (*Serm.* i. 10. 44)

> molle atque facetum

is reminiscent of Vergil's own characterization of his work. The line was written probably some six years after the *Ciris*. It is, I think, not exaggerated pedantry to see in Horace's *molle* a direct reference to Vergil's own use of the word and to find in the technical term *facetum* a reference to Vergil's *ludere*, when we consider that

---

[1] The problem of the "styles" is too involved to discuss here. My point of view is briefly this: Cicero in the *De oratore* makes actual use of only two classes, the *grande* and the *tenue*. The middle style is there considered a vague intermediate mixture of the two. Though later in the *Orator* (20 ff.) he identifies the three styles with the three traditional *officia* of the orator (*docere, delectare, movere*) and fills the indefinite *medium* with the connotations of *delectare*, his interest still lies with the two definite types which he divides each into two classes according as they are treated with natural simplicity or with artifice. He thus arrives at four distinct types: (1*a*) *grandis sed aspera*, (1*b*) *grandis et ornata*, (2*c*) *tenuis et impolita*, (2*d*) *tenuis sed concinnior, faceta et florida* (*Orat.* 20). It seems to me that Demetrius and Philodemus mean practically the same thing when, without speaking of the "characters" of style, they mention four methods of composition. Demetrius has (to give them in Cicero's order): (*a*) δεινόν, the forceful, often closely related to the grand; (*b*) μεγαλοπρεπές, the grand and ornate; (*c*) ἰσχνόν, the simple and plain; and (*d*) γλαφυρόν, a polished style used in unambitious subjects. Philodemus' plasmata seem to me to rest upon the same tradition; they are (*Rhet.* Sud. 165. 4): ἁδρόν, μέγα, ἰσχνόν, γλαφυρόν. Indeed, if we recognize that in his chapter on method Dionysius (*De comp.* xxii) is chiefly concerned in the two manners of composition, the austere and the ornate, and that the "middle" manner is a more or less inconsistent concession to Theophrastian traditions, we may apply these two manners to the two chief styles (*De dem.* iii) and again arrive at Cicero's four divisions. The authors may be compared as follows:

CICERO "ORAT." 20.	DEMETRIUS	PHILODEMUS	HORACE "SERM." i. 10. 40.
grande et asperum	δεινόν	μέγα	Varius and Pollio
grande et ornatum	μεγαλοπρεπές	ἁδρόν	turgidus Alpinus
tenue et impolitum	ἰσχνόν	ἰσχνόν	Fundanius
tenue sed floridum	γλαφυρόν	γλαφυρόν	Vergilius molle atque facetum

I therefore assume that the tradition of four manners of writing was in general use at Roman schools in the days of the *neoteroi*, and that these poets claimed to practice the simple plain style (*c*) in their *nugae*, and the related polished and pleasing, unambitious style (*d*) in their *epyllia*. Stroux, *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi* (1912), 104 ff., and Herrle, *Quaest-rhetoricae* (1912), 54 ff., contain many good suggestions.

Horace is here in the midst of a literary controversy and inten-
tionally choosing terms from the contemporaneous critical vocabu-
lary that had well-recognized connotations.[1]

Now if Vergil and Horace are using the terms with the same
meaning, it may be fair to find in Horace the clue to Vergil's
intention.   Horace's well-known lines are (*Serm*. i. 10. 36–45):

> *Turgidus Alpinus* jugulat dum Memnona, dumque
> Defingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo,
> Quae neque in aede sonent certantia judice Tarpa,
> Nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris.
> Arguta meretrice potes Davoque Chremeta
> Eludente senem *comis garrire* libellos
> Unus vivorum, Fundani; *Pollio regum*
> *Facta canit pede ter percusso; forte epos acer*
> *Ut nemo Varius* ducit; *molle atque facetum*
> *Vergilio* annuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae.

Horace is here obviously speaking of various literary genres, but his
grouping of them seems to me to betray a consciousness of the four-
fold classification of styles.   The *plain* style is naturally represented
by the comic poet Fundanius.   For the *grand* style he has no good
contemporary example since Pollio[2] and Varius, whose tragedies and
epics might serve, eschewed by choice all ambitious adornment, and
they consequently represent the *forceful* style (δεινόν: *forte epos
acer Varius*).[3]   The *grand* style is with covert humor assigned, in
the absence of a real claimant, to the *turgidus Alpinus* who repre-
sents its exaggerated form, the ψυχρόν.   To Vergil is left, as it seems
to me, the remaining of the four types, the γλαφυρόν of Demetrius,
analyzed by Horace into *molle atque facetum*.

Let us then examine Demetrius' definition and description of
this style. Ὁ γλαφυρὸς λόγος, he says, χαριεντισμὸς καὶ ἱλαρὸς λόγος
ἐστί ("charm and geniality," *op. cit.* 128, Roberts' edition, p. 120).

---

[1] Horace's phrase has frequently been discussed. See especially Bayard, *Rev. de
Phil.* (1904), p. 213; Jackson, *op. cit.;* Ogle, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* (1916), p. 327; Knapp,
Amer. Jour. Phil (1917), p. 194.

[2] Pollio seems to have chosen the chaste Sophoclean style as his model, Verg.
Eclogues viii. 10. Tacitus *Dial.* 21 calls his tragedy, as well as his prose style, *durus
et siccus.* Puristic tendencies seem to underlie his criticism of Livy, Sallust, and
Catullus.

[3] Martial viii. 18. 7, *fortius ore.*

What he means by χαριεντισμός—and its connotations are numerous
—appears from the contextual examples and definitions.   Deme-
trius' instances of χάριτες include witticisms, graceful and charm-
ing phrases, and passages without obvious humor, beautiful names,
and what musical critics called "smooth words" (128–31, 173, 176);
and in subject-matter they associated especially with themes like
"the gardens of the Nymphs, marriage songs, love stories, and
indeed were found in the poetry of Sappho generally" (132).

The chief quality (χάρις) of the polished style is therefore just
that combination of charming grace and well-bred good humor that
the "new poets" sought to embody in their more ambitious work.
When they used the term *facetum* to characterize this in part, they
knew that the inadequate word had to be filled with a new literary
connotation which it had not contained in Cicero's discussion of the
facetiae of prose orations.   And Quintilian was aware of this differ-
ence when, in explanation of Horace's phrase, he said (vi. 3. 20):
*Decoris hanc magis et excultae cuiusdam elegantiae appellationem
puto.*

Molle seems to be a translation of the Greek μαλακόν and μαλθακόν,
and Dionysius, though not recognizing a γλαφυρὸς χαρακτήρ, does
define a smooth diction (γλαφυρά) as requiring that all words[1] be
λεῖα καὶ μαλακά καὶ παρθενωπά.   It appears, then, that in the tech-
nical language of the day the qualities that were most marked in the
graceful *epyllia* of the *neoteroi* were precisely those that Demetrius
placed in his definition of the γλαφυρόν so far as he discussed
poetry rather than prose, and that this term connoted what Vergil
and Horace meant by *molle atque facetum.*

Of course we do not know the date of Demetrius.   Since he has
been assigned to so many of the hundred or over bearers of that
name already known, it may be futile to add new conjectures.   But

[1] "Melodious, smooth, soft as a maiden's face," ed. Roberts, p. 235.   When
Demetrius discusses the excess of this style, calling it κακόζηλον (186), "affectation,"
he reminds us of nothing so much as the simpering phrases that Seneca has quoted
from the works of Maecenas *Epist. Mor.* 114. 5.   Is it not clear that Maecenas,
influenced perhaps by Vergil's early work, unsuccessfully set himself the model of
the γλαφυρὸς χαρακτήρ?   And is not this the meaning of Agrippa's witticism on Vergil
and Maecenas quoted by Donatus (*Vita* 44): "a Maecenate eum suppositum appel-
labat novae cacozeliae repertore, non tumidae nec exilis [not the excesses of the grand
or plain styles] sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis"?   This criticism was
probably written in the early thirties.

it seems to me that a more improbable guess could be made than
that he might be the very rhetorician, Demetrius, at whom Horace
flings his abuse in lines 79 and 90 of his tenth satire.[1] Of course
there is but little value in such conjectures. The only purpose in
making it is to attract attention once more to the possibility of
dating this interesting work in the first century B.C. The important
fact is that the fourfold division of the styles (apparently no inven-
tion of Demetrius') had been made public property before Horace
wrote this satire; for Philodemus, as was long ago pointed out, had
knowledge of it.[2] No one who has considered what the Neapolitan
hortus meant to Vergil in his youth would be at all likely to assume
that Vergil did not read the essays of the Gadarene on their appear-
ance. Indeed, even Cicero in the passage cited by Quintilian,

> Ne illi sunt pedes *faceti* ac delicatius ingredienti *molles*,

is apparently using quotation marks if, as seems likely, the line is
sarcastic. The phrase was possibly a catchword of the neoteric
apologists.

It would be interesting to know to how much of Vergil's early
work the term of Horace applied. Horace specifically calls atten-
tion to the pastoral (*gaudentes rure Camenae*), but, as we have seen,
both Horace and Vergil seem to class the *Culex* as a kind of pastoral
poem. The *Ciris*, by Vergil's own definition, also falls into the
group of the γλαφυρὸν γένος. This poem Horace may have been

---

[1] Horace's taunts: "men moveat . . . . quod vellicet absentem Demetrius?"
(*Serm.* i. 10. 78) and

Demetri, teque, Tigelli,
Discipularum inter jubeo plorare cathedras (*ibid.* 91)

probably refer to ill feeling engendered by professional jealousy on the part of rhetors
who had not, like Apollodorus, the entrée into the circles of Augustus and Maecenas.
If, however, this be the author of the well-known work *De elocutione*, we can well
understand that he must have been more sympathetic toward the romantic schools of
poetry than Horace and Apollodorus could be.

For the date of Demetrius see Roberts' edition, pp. 49–64. The expression in
108, πορφύραις πλατείαις, seems to refer to some architectural ornament, but even so
it is not decisive. Broad expanses of crimson and red coloring occur first in the
"second style" of house decoration at Rome (about 60 B.C.+, see the "house of
Livia" at Rome), but they continue to be fashionable into the early Empire. It is,
however, difficult to explain 179: οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν πρὶν εἴρηταί τινι περὶ γλαφυρᾶς συνθέσεως,
unless we place Demetrius before Dionysius.

[2] The plasmata of Philodemus (*Rhet.* Sud. 165) are very near to the styles of
composition of Demetrius (Wilamowitz, *Hermes* [1900], p. 30, n. 4).

permitted to read. Indeed, the lines of the *Ciris* (19–20) already quoted would seem to imply that the youthful verses in general were to be considered of this genre. Certainly the definitions of the genre given by Demetrius are sufficiently broad to cover the poems *Catalepton*, not to mention the very graceful bit of ornate realism of the *Copa*.

From this we may conclude that Vergil at first identified himself quite completely with the neoteric school, that he accepted as the proper description of such work the definitions of the "polished" style propounded by critics like Demetrius, and that even after he had written the *Bucolics* his contemporaries thought of him as the leading representative of the polished style. He reveals, however, the fact that it was not his ultimate ideal. He very early entertained ambitions of writing a philosophical poem (*Ciris* i. 5; *Georgics* ii. 477), and even before Julius Caesar's death aspired to write the epic of his country (*Cat.* 14; *Eclogues* vi. 2), tasks which he considered worthy of a loftier style than that employed in the Alexandrian work he was doing.

Vergil's next expression is the well-known fifth *Catalepton* bidding farewell to his books of rhetoric and turning for all time from a public career. This poem, of course, does not contain any creed of poetic art. It obviously expresses the hearty disgust at the dry details of rhetorical or grammatical rules of one who has caught visions of what a positivistic philosophy can promise. There are, however, some especially significant phrases which show that Vergil's teacher has forfeited his respect by too strong a faith in the old-fashioned rules now being attacked by the Atticists. Such scornful phrases as *rhetorum ampullae, inflata* . . . . *verba, madens pingui* . . . . *inani, cymbalon iuventutis*, indicate that this teacher had not been of Calvus' school. It is probable also that the Varro of whose book the poet had had a surfeit was the well-known encyclopedist, who, as Cicero casually says, had the bad taste to like the style of Hegesias, the father of Asianism.[1] Varro was himself an author of a book on the types of style. If that was written on a substructure of Hegesianic taste and Vergil had to study it, the tone of these lines can well be

---

[1] See Norden, *Rhein. Mus.* (1893), p. 547. Varro had probably not been giving rhetorical exercises at this time (Cic. *Ad fam.* ix. 1).

excused. At any rate, the lines show that, though Vergil had adopted the *molle atque facetum* as his forte in verse, he did not intend to practice it to excess. And as for the content of this work, his last line suggests that he had already seen the need of pruning the *facetum* which in his beloved Catullus had led to coarseness. "If the Muses return, as they may, they shall still be welcome, but they must come *pudenter et raro.*" He does not, therefore, turn his back upon the Alexandrian charm and sweetness; he merely shows a determination to write with more artistic reserve.

There is, also, in a brief *Catalepton* (No. vii) a passing reflection of the literary controversy centering about the subject of pure diction. Here Vergil pretends to acquiesce in Varius' insistence upon *Latinitas* by correcting the Greek word *pothos* of the second line to *puer* in the fourth. Varius, and perhaps Quintilius Varus, had already begun that movement—soon to receive the aid of Pollio, Horace, Messalla, and Octavian, the pupil of the Atticist Apollodorus—toward a stricter diction and a more classical form in Latin verse; a movement which seems to have been begun by a puristic secession within the neoteric group and to have ended very soon in a complete opposition to the neoteric ideal.[1]

Vergil's epigram is in entire good humor. Varius is an excellent friend and Vergil by no means derides his hobby. Vergil himself, as we see from his later work, learned some caution from these critics; but he was too intelligent to adopt an extreme theory which threatened to shackle poetry.

This epigram affords an early date for the new movement so often referred to by Horace; it seems to identify that movement with Vergil's friend Varius, and it shows Vergil in the sane attitude of a man who intends to rely upon his own judgment.

The second *Catalepton* contains another somewhat obscure reference to the literary controversies of the day. Many attempts at restoring and interpreting the epigram have been made. Professors DeWitt and Fairclough have perhaps contributed most to its

---

[1] Cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.* (1917), p. 341, who gives a clear explanation of the relationship between the Horatian group and the *neoteroi* with reference to the question of diction. Birt gave the right interpretation of this poem in *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils*, p. 83.

elucidation.[1] I can add but little to what they have said and I venture that only for the sake of bringing this epigram into the account of Vergil's utterances on style. The poem seems to me to read as follows:

> Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
> iste iste rhetor, namque quatenus totus
> Thucydides, Britannus, Attice febris!
> tau Gallicum min et sphin ut male illisit,
> ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.

"That lover of archaic words, that tiresome rhetor, surely he's as much (and as little) a Thucydides as he is a real British prince! He the bane of real Attic style! It was his mixture of Greek archaisms and Celtic pronunciation, I suppose, that killed his brother."

The reference is, of course, to the rhetorician Annius Cimber, the friend of Antony. There are apparently two points of attack: (1) Cimber seems to have been a man of low station (Cic. *Phil.* xi. 14) who tried to pass, as freedmen then frequently did,[2] as the descendant of some unfortunate barbarian prince. Since his Celtic brogue betrayed him, he chose to call himself British. Vergil in the epigram seems to imply that he had assumed the brogue (*tau Gallicum*) as well as the name to escape the odium attached to Eastern freedmen. (2) Cimber claimed to be an Atticist, but his ignorance of Greek—shown in his use of non-Attic forms and the adoption of Thucydides as a model for Atticistic orators—made him the laughingstock of the *docti*. Now the Thucydides craze at Rome had a very interesting history, and this passage affords a pertinent commentary on some passages in Cicero. In the *Orator* (30) Cicero drives full tilt at some unknown person who, while claiming to be an Atticist, has adopted Thucydides as his model. What

---

[1] DeWitt, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* (1912), p. 317; Fairclough, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, XLVII, 43 ff. I adopt DeWitt's text with a slightly different interpretation.

[2] So Hermeros in *Petronius* 57. Cimber's father bore a Greek cognomen, but Gallic and Germanic slaves were not infrequently given Oriental slave names. His own choice of "Cimber" was probably an early attempt to point to a loftier Western extraction. Presumably, like Antonius Gnipho, he was a Gaul who secured a Greek education. The reader will also remember Valerius Cato's claims to good birth defended in his *Indignatio;* cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.*, XI, 268.

results is to Cicero a *novum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus,* as it was to Vergil. Reference to the same strange aberration is found in Cicero's *Brutus* 287–88.

Cicero indeed suggests in part (*loc. cit.*) how the shibboleths got mixed. In Calvus' day when the Roman Atticistic group were making their program they made liberal use of Peripatetic and Stoic theories advocating conciseness, perspicuity, and purity of grammar and diction.[1] The Stoic axiom recommending the antique simplicity that was nearer nature, since it antedated the baneful school of rhetoricians, seemed to lead back logically to Thucydides as the first important Attic writer of prose. Thus it was that someone, following purely theoretical considerations with insufficient insight or taste, wrote the name of Thucydides on the banner of that Atticism which in general was supposed to stand for the artistic simplicity of Lysias.

Since Sallust adopted Thucydides as his model in history and also aspired to fame as a writer of speeches, it is not impossible—if, indeed, Sallust had thus early made his preference known—that he was the man in question. Cicero's reference, however, seems to be aimed at some earlier doctrinaire, possibly at Vergil's victim, Cimber,[2] who had already entered politics in the year when the *Brutus* was written. Even Pollio and Messalla, who were later accused of fondness for patinated diction, seem in their youth to have been influenced by this heresy. Cicero's plain words in 46 B.C. should have corrected the error of those who did not know enough Greek to comprehend the color of Thucydides' style. Both Demetrius and Dionysius seem to take cognizance of the misunderstanding when they point out the many stately and ornate passages, not to mention the many lapses into obscurity and roughness, which would naturally disqualify Thucydides from being a model of Atticistic simplicity.[3]

---

[1] See Stroux, *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi;* Hendrickson, *Amer. Jour. Phil.,* XXV, 125; XXVI, 249 ff.; Smiley, *Latinitas and* Ἑλληνισμός; Fiske, *The Plain Style in the Scipionic Circle.*

[2] Cimber's importance is attested by no less a person than Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 86).

[3] Demetrius 40, 44, 72, etc. Dionysius, Roberts' ed., pp. 178, 228; *Ad Ammaeum* ii. 2.

The point of Vergil's taunt is, then, that despite Cicero's attack Cimber still harps upon Thucydides, while pretending to be an Atticist. To the poet Cimber was not an Atticist but an "Attic plague," an allusion perhaps to the Athenian plague so gruesomely described by Thucydides.[1] As for Vergil himself, his epigram is, therefore, an attack not upon the genuine Atticists but upon the inconsistent claims of an ignorant rhetor.

There are but few other references in Vergil's works to theories of style. It should, however, be noted that while the youthful Vergil, like Horace, connects himself closely with the group which was laboring for a stricter classicism—Quintilius Varus, Varius Rufus, Pollio, Valgius (who translated the *Ars* of Apollodorus), and, of course, Octavian, the pupil of Apollodorus—he still speaks of Cinna and Gallus,[2] the sole important survivors of the neoteric school, with more than respect, pays his regards to Parthenius and Euphorion when the new classicists had abandoned them, and honors Catullus as his master by open imitation even in the *Aeneid*.[3] In a word, Vergil before the publication of the *Georgics*, while associating with the group that combated the program of Valerius Cato, considered himself and was considered by his associates as a representative of the neoteric school.[4]

In attempting thus to place Vergil in a more or less circumscribed niche hewed out by rhetorical analysts, I would not be understood as believing that the poet while composing set himself the task of seriously concerning himself with theories of style. He certainly did this far less than Horace. As a confirmed Epicurean he scorned slavish adherence to rhetorical rules, and the outburst

---

[1] See Fairclough, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, *loc. cit.*

[2] Cornificius, who, to judge from Cicero's letters (especially *Ad fam.* xii. 17), was a very important member of the group in its latter days, may possibly be the subject of Vergil's pastoral elegy *Daphnis*. This poet was killed in 41 B.C. while attempting to hold Africa for the republican cause, a possible reason why obvious allusions were not incorporated in the poem. If one recalls Bion and Moschus, it is difficult to escape the conviction that some friend of the guild is concerned here, and Cornificius is the only poet whose death can with certainty be placed at this time. See *Class. Rev.*, 1920, 49.

[3] DeWitt, *The Dido Episode*, p. 75.

[4] For the influence of Vergil's early habits of work on the *Aeneid*, see Duckett, *Class. Jour.* (1915), p. 333.

against the rhetors in his youth expressed, I think, an attitude
which he maintained throughout life.   Attempts, for instance, to
analyze, say, Sinon's speech according to the schematized laws of
Hermagoras seem to me wholly misleading.   Vergil certainly did
not look upon rhetoric as an ἐπιστήμη: he was very far from being
an Apollodorean.

Nevertheless he was certainly in touch with the theories of style
then current, as every man of culture had to be, for it was the
rhetoricians and *grammatici* who were the literary critics of the day,
who wrote the book reviews, as it were, who analyzed the poets,
placed them to some extent on their proper pedestals, coined the
literary phrases, and told the public what ought to be read.   Horace's
scoffs at critical rhetoricians like Demetrius and Hermogenes, con-
signing them back to their ladies' seminaries, show that they counted
for something when they spoke.   And after all the poets themselves
had studied with the rhetoricians, learned their systems, and memo-
rized their phrases.   When, therefore, the poets spoke of their own
work they must use the literary phraseology of the schools, with the
connotations that were orthodox.   Hence, despite the freedom of
composition that a poet like Vergil might display, when he sat back
and analyzed the product of his creative mind he would think and
speak of it in scholastic terms in so far as he could find adequate
ones current.   It is with this fact in view that we are justified in
searching for the peculiar categories of the schools which Vergil
and his contemporaries thought befitting his style of work.

To be sure, literary criticism in Vergil's schooldays was very
young and timid.   One of its gravest shortcomings, as a reading of
Dionysius and Demetrius will show, lay in its failure to deal with
poetry apart from prose.[1]   Perhaps the traditional interest in
forensic prose on the part of Roman young men compelled the
teachers even against their inclination to center their dicta about
the orators.   Be that as it may, it would seem that the very con-
sciously scholastic group of new poets who had gathered about
Valerius Cato in Cicero's day had to think out their program along

---

[1] Varro apparently illustrated the three styles in Roman literature by reference
principally to poets.   He chose Pacuvius, Lucilius, and Terence as the representa-
tives respectively of the *ubera*, *gracilis*, *mediocris* (Gellius vi. 14).

the lines of the orthodox classification of styles invented for the
analysis of oratory.   Very little has survived to inform us what
were the main tenets of Cato's formulae by which he "made the
poets" of that circle.   It is generally assumed that the prose style
of Calvus, who called himself an Atticist and a follower of Lysias,
probably harmonized with the teachings of Cato.   Calvus, as we
know, tried to be direct, lucid, simple, pure, and homely in diction.
He shunned the pompous and emotional in style, unusual and
affected words, and all meretricious effects of metrical prose.   The
lucid and limpid *nugae* of Catullus written in the artless words of
everyday Rome justify us in supposing that much of the poetry
coming from Cato's pupils was inspired by the same ideals that
Cicero attributes to Calvus.

That, however, could hardly have been the whole story.
Catullus' *epyllion* is neither lucid nor limpid, nor can the diction
be described as pure and colloquial Latin.   It abounds in poetic
diction that borrows freely from the Greek vocabularies for effects
in grace, smoothness, and softness of sound; its narrative is intri-
cately involved, its emphasis subjective, and its color entirely emo-
tional.   And we know enough of other adherents of Cato, poets
like Cinna and Ticidas, not to mention Calvus as author of the *Io*
and Vergil of the *Ciris*, to know that Cato must have encouraged
the practice of such writing in certain genres of poetry.   For this
style I think we may find a fairly close counterpart in the prose of
Calidius, who must have said something about his program when he
criticized [1] Cicero's oratory.   Calidius, whose style is very generously
described by Cicero (*Brut.* 274), was a friend of Caesar and the
Atticists in general, and apparently thought of himself as a kind
of Atticist but as one whose prose was more closely connected with
the neoteric *epyllia* than with the *nugae*.

Cicero's description of his orations is one of the most interesting
in the whole fascinating book.

Ita reconditas exquisitasque sententias mollis et pellucens vestiebat
oratio.   Nihil tam tenerum . . . . nullum nisi loco positum et tamquam
in vermiculato emblemate, ut ait Lucilius, structum verbum videres.   Nec
vero ullum aut durum aut insolens aut humile aut longius ductum; ac non
propria verba rerum sed pleraque translata, etc.

[1] Cic. *Ad. Att.* v. 19. 3; *se solet anteferre (mihi)*, *Ad. Att.* vi. 8. 3.

What better description could we have of such a style than the phrase *molle atque facetum* employed as Vergil and Horace used that phrase?

I have quoted this passage to show reason for supposing that, in the group of poets and orators which gathered about Valerius Cato, the so-called *subtile genus* was quite regularly divided into two styles, and that, just as in poetry Catullus represented natural simplicity in his lyrics, but a polished and graceful tenuosity in the *epyllia*, so the thin-drawn Atticism of Calvus was quite distinct from the graceful though unemotional artistry of Calidius. Surely it is in recognition of such growing theories that Cicero, while pretending in traditional fashion to hold to the threefold division of styles, actually abandons the "middle" style and works out his criticism in the *Orator* and the *Brutus* by a dichotomy of the other two.[1] Only thus could he discuss the contemporary poets and orators in contemporary language. We need not, of course, suppose that his description of Calidius consisted of quotations: Calidius' style was apparently so striking that a use of plain Latin would be adequate for the purpose. However, Cicero knew these people intimately from Valerius Cato to Gallus,[2] and there is every reason for believing that he intentionally adopted their terms, though he still refused a frank acknowledgment of their fourfold analysis.

The point of this digression is that the designation of Vergil's early work not only as *tenue* and *gracile* but as *molle* and *facetum* would seem to have been a recognition of his close affiliation with the ideals of the romantic group just passing away.

Soon Vergil became an intimate member of the new group gathering about the young Octavian, the tendencies of which were drawing in a new direction. It would be very interesting to know who was the guiding spirit here. The revolt was, of course, not all a matter of conscious theory. In poetry as in prose, the outburst of the Civil War changed men's outlook on life, men's interests and psychology. As Cicero's leisurely periods lost a hearing in a new

---

[1] In a letter to Cornificius, one of the neoteric poets, Cicero uses a strange phrase that has led to much discussion: *vos magnos oratores* (*Ad. fam.* xii. 18). Did Cornificius claim to represent the *forceful* style—the δεινόν of Demetrius—as Calvus represented the ἰσχνόν and Calidius the γλαφυρόν? The μεγαλοπρεπές was of course completely avoided by the group.

[2] "Cicero and the Poetae Novi," *Amer. Jour. Phil.* (1919), p. 396; for Gallus see *Ad fam.* x. 31. 6.

world of realities, till he was piqued into defending his creed and practice in several pamphlets, so the romantic and to some extent affected and sentimental poets of the fifties began to cloy in the hard days of Caesar's dictatorship. A revolt was inevitable, and when it came it brought, as such things will, not a little strife. Documents like the third *Eclogue* and the tenth *Satire* show that there was battling and blood-letting. Wilamowitz[1] has said that the new classicism had no connection with the immediate past and that Apollodorus was its founder. This is doubtless an exaggeration, though the great rhetorician must not be forgotten. Apollodorus taught at Rome before 44 B.C.—how long we do not know. He must have been a man of great influence to be chosen by Caesar to teach his heir. Valgius (presumably Valgius Rufus), one of the best friends of the youthful Vergil and Horace, had translated the master's book into Latin, and finally the old teacher seems to have been a daily companion of the group about Maecenas, if I am correct in identifying him with the Heliodorus of Horace, *Sermo* I. 5.

Although there is no gainsaying the weight of Apollodorus' influence, we must recognize the fact that the germs of the new Augustan literary growth had been cast in the soil of Rome in the generation that preceded. In the first place, many of the older men like Cicero had lived through the neoteric period without being deeply moved by it, and had in their literary works never tired of repeating the lines of Ennius and the great Greeks from whom the Ennian period drew. In fact, the classical authors had not wholly been pushed aside in the fifties, even by men like Catullus. Moreover, the influence of the neo-Atticistic prose—developed largely, it will be remembered, by men closely associated with the neoteric poets—leaned strongly toward a classical purity and simplicity. Men like Messalla and Pollio were forces working with Horace and not against him; Pollio indeed had grown up with Catullus and Calvus, while Messalla probably owed much to his devotion to Brutus. Furthermore, some of the rules most insistently advocated by the Augustan school, especially simplicity, lucidity, and purity of diction, were apparently a part of Valerius Cato's program in so far as it applied to lyrical poetry. These

[1] Wilamowitz, *Hermes* (1900), pp. 1 ff.

particular qualities are no more vital to Horace's odes than to
Catullus' epigrams and songs.   And leaders of Augustan criticism
like Varus and Varius Rufus seem to have grown up in the Po
Valley where Cato's influence was strongest.   Vergil's youthful
epigram to Varius does not need a reference to Apollodorus in order
to be understood.   The Augustan revolt undoubtedly struck at
certain tendencies of the Catullian group, as we have said, and, as is
natural, differences are apt at such times to be emphasized over and
above similarities; but after the dust of battle has passed away we
can see how the Augustans, after all, evolved their favorite doctrines
out of some of the qualities that had been consciously sought for by
the preceding generation of poets.   That certain of their qualities,
those of the γένος γλαφυρόν, no longer found favor was largely due
to the change in the world that ushered in the Augustan age.

As for Vergil, he began his schooldays as a confirmed neoteric
poet.   In his years of apprenticeship, when his associates began to
shake off the influences of the past, Vergil refused to sell his birth-
right.   To be sure, he saw as clearly as they the superficial vices of
the more languid neoteric poetry, but he also felt the charm and
emotional appeal in the best of it.   Its external tricks of style, in so
far as they were false, he pruned away, but he treasured what his
ear and heart told him was good poetry.   From his associates he
accepted the program of chastening and patient application, but
he refused to go the long road with some of them to impersonal
formalism.   Though he maintained his independence, he was too
great to be thrust aside as a negligible nonconformist like Furius
Bibaculus and Cato's ape.[1]   He was accordingly accepted as one of
the friendly group and set down as representing a style all his own.
To the last he was criticized by the formalists.   Agrippa found him
too freely colloquial, Horace had to defend him from the opposite
charge of using unusual and foreign-sounding words, while the purists
parodied his diction as smacking of the provinces.   But superficial
criticism probably concerned him little.   He never forgot that,
though he wrote for the Rome of Augustus, he had for many years
been the pupil of Catullus.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

[1] I have indicated elsewhere that *simius iste* (Horace *Serm.* i. 10) may be the
poet Ticidas.

INORGANIC RÔLES IN ROMAN COMEDY

By Henry W. Prescott

In introductory studies I have endeavored to apply a mild corrective to the views of Leo and his followers who, believing that Euripidean tragedy seriously affected the form and content of Hellenistic comedy, have been led by their opinion to differentiate as Roman many inartistic features of Latin comedy.[1] Among the inartistic features often selected by modern students of Roman plays to strengthen theories of contamination, or of Roman workmanship in general, are characters in the plays that seem to be loosely or mechanically attached to the action. So, for example, the rôles of Ergasilus in the *Captivi*, of Lurcio in the *Miles*, of Syncerastus in the *Poenulus*, of Callipho and Charinus in the *Pseudolus*, of Gripus in the *Rudens*, of Gelasimus in the *Stichus*, have been used to confirm notions that these plays either include inlays of Roman material or are weakened in structure by poor dovetailing of material from two or more Greek plays. In my own opinion the method of segregating inartistic features in a given play as proof of Roman intervention is distinctly dangerous. Any inartistic feature may be the common property of all or many plays, not the peculiar possession of one or several comedies, and we may not safely estimate the value, for purposes of proving Roman craftsmanship, of a single inartistic feature in a given play until we have considered in the large the manifestation in all the twenty-six Roman plays of that special feature. In this paper, therefore, I undertake a synthetic study of inorganic rôles. Constant comparison with Greek tragedy, though necessarily brief and sketchy, will indicate the relation to each other of the two dramatic types. If the results do not by any means settle the historical problems involved in a consideration of the precise extent and nature of Roman contribution, they may at least provide a convenient summary of one interesting aspect of dramatic technique.

[1] Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XI, 125 ff.; XII, 405 ff.; XIII, 113 ff.; XIV, 108 ff.; and P. E. Sonnenburg, *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, XXXIV (1917), 623 ff.; Schwering, *N. Jahrbb.*, XXXVII (1916), 167 ff.

Precise definition may be necessary to successful argument but it is often a hindrance to helpful exposition. I do not feel obliged to define what I mean by inorganic rôles, except in a somewhat negative sense. Dramatic action in Roman comedy is carried on mainly by characters who continue through the play and are closely interwoven in the web of the plot. Apart from these there are a number of other characters who may in different degrees be called inorganic. Occasionally a fairly permanent character, in spite of his permanence, may be loosely attached to the main action, as, for example, Ergasilus in the *Captivi*. More obviously inorganic rôles are filled by temporary characters, who appear for a single scene or brief sequence of scenes. But temporary characters are not necessarily inorganic; if, for example, a plot involving financial transactions makes the appearance of a banker desirable for a single scene, such a character is not loosely or mechanically attached to the action provided his appearance is properly prepared for and his departure at the end of the scene made as inevitable as possible; under these conditions a temporary rôle becomes essentially organic. And any dramatist has to employ a number of minor rôles, messengers, servants, and what not, who will be helpful in promoting dialogue or action and in serving various economic purposes but who will not always continue through the play. In brief, inorganic rôles are likely to be temporary, but characters who appear temporarily are not necessarily inorganic. And contrariwise, occasionally even a fairly permanent rôle may be inorganic. I am interested in any rôles that seem to be in any degree loosely or mechanically attached to the main action.

The standpoint from which such rôles can be best appreciated seems to me to be that of the dramatist. He has problems of composition with which we must enter into sympathy if we are to understand the results. These problems differ at different stages of his work. At the outset he must expound a situation; after that expository stage he must initiate, develop, and solve the complications of dramatic action. These last three stages of dramatic composition have common difficulties to a large extent; but the solution sometimes makes special demands upon the playwright's skill. Broadly speaking, the beginning and the end of

a play test the dramatist's art more than the middle; to this fact
the prologist, the protatic rôle, the god from the machine, bear
ample witness.

I

The inorganic prologist has been discussed by many others and
need not detain us. The protatic rôle is a familiar feature of classi-
cal drama. The term is applied to a character more or less mechani-
cally attached to the opening scene, or scenes, of a play to assist
in the exposition, but disappearing from the action as soon as this
service is performed. In the half-dozen instances of the rôle in
Roman comedy the protatic character seldom himself narrates and
expounds. In the *Epidicus*, however, Thesprio does communicate
essential facts, and in the *Mercator* Acanthio, more as messenger
than as protatic rôle, reports the critical news that the father has
seen his son's sweetheart. In the *Phormio*, *Hecyra*, and *Andria*,
on the other hand, the protatic rôle simply provides ears to listen
to the exposition by another character in the dialogue. In the
Mostellaria the conversation in which the protatic rôle participates
neatly reveals, not only the situation, but the sharply contrasted
characters of Grumio and Tranio. And in the *Miles* the function
of the protatic flatterer is to delineate the character of the soldier;
the exposition is left to a subsequent prologue. But all these rôles
are alike in so far as they are alien to the later action and more
or less mechanically attached to advance the exposition or portray
character. Thesprio, to be sure, in the *Epidicus* is momentarily
rehabilitated later in the play (vss. 657–60), but without resum-
ing an active part; on the other hand, in the contaminated exposi-
tion[1] of the *Andria*, the protatic rôle is instructed to perform certain
duties in the subsequent action (vss. 168–70) which are not repre-
sented in the later scenes of the play. These expository rôles
are filled by slaves except in the *Miles* and *Hecyra*, in which a flat-
terer and courtezans, respectively, assume the part. The entrance
and the exit of the protatic character are managed with varying
degrees of skill, but no amount of skilful motivation can disguise
the mechanical function of the rôle.

[1] Cf. Donatus on *And.* prol. 10 and 14, and F. Schöll, "Menanders Perinthia
in der Andria des Terenz," *Sitzb. d. Heidelberg. Akad.* (1912), No. 7, pp. 4 ff.

The protatic rôle is substantially Greek. The technical term "protatic" is part of a Greek theory that labels the exposition "protasis"; the rôle appears, perhaps, in the extant scene of Menander's *Heros;*[1] and Aristophanic comedy and Greek tragedy abundantly foreshadow the protatic rôle of later comedy.

The *Knights, Peace,* and *Wasps* of Aristophanes begin with a dialogue scene between two slaves, one of whom disappears from the action at the end of the scene. But Aristophanic comedy has no plot; there is a situation or theme. And in these three plays the situation is expounded in an address to the audience by one of the two slaves who is not protatic, his speech foreshadowing the later prologue of comedy. The protatic slave in Aristophanes, therefore, is hardly a device to assist in exposition, but rather a means of developing dialogue, and dialogue that covers not so much exposition as idle banter. It will be observed that in promoting conversation the protatic rôle in Aristophanes is similar to the corresponding slave in Roman comedy, and if there were a complicated plot to expound, doubtless his ears in Aristophanes would listen to exposition instead of to trivial jest, to which he not only listens but contributes.

Greek tragedy before Euripides develops exposition in the form of either monologue or dialogue. In the monologue form the speaker is sometimes protatic in so far as he drops out of the action after his speech; so in the *Agamemnon* and *Eumenides* of Aeschylus; but as monologue his speech anticipates rather the later detachable prologue. In the dialogue exposition of the *Prometheus* there are characters alien to the subsequent action; the special conditions of the plot perhaps made it difficult to create organic characters who could naturally appear in the region of the Caucasus. In Sophocles the protatic rôle exists usually in a refined form. The priest who converses with Oedipus in the *Oedipus Rex* helps to reveal the situation, but he comes and goes with perfect naturalness, and he gives rather than receives information; his presence issues inevitably out of the distressing circumstances that he narrates. In the *Ajax* a protatic divinity gives Odysseus as well as the audience valuable information. In the *Antigone* Ismene is not protatic;

[1] Cf. Leo, *Hermes,* XLIII, 146.

she appears in a later scene to redeem herself; but it is interesting to observe that in the opening scene she sets in bold relief the character of her stronger sister and provides ears to listen to Antigone's exposition. The servant and the nurse who participate in opening scenes of the *Electra* and the *Trachiniae*, respectively, return to the action later, as does Ismene, and both stir the other characters in the dialogue to action. Thus Sophocles hovers dangerously near the mechanism of the protatic rôle without descending to the lower grades of technique.

Even in Euripides the mechanical protatic rôle is not profusely employed. Thanatos in the *Alcestis* is superficially protatic, but his quarrel with Apollo is a conflict of forces symbolizing the issues of the play. So, too, the reconciliation of the divine powers, Athena and Poseidon, in the *Troades* prepares us for the anti-Greek and pro-Trojan temper of the play. The effect in both the plays is of a supernatural and symbolic prelude to the action rather than of anything fundamentally expository. In the *Andromache* the maidservant conveys important information and is dispatched on an errand that promotes the action; she is, however, protatic in form. The servant in the scene following the prologue of the *Hippolytus* is also protatic, but his function is neither to give nor receive information but by his polite suggestion to bring out the "holier-than-thou" attitude of Hippolytus, assisting therefore in character portrayal as does the protatic rôle in comedy oftentimes, but emerging naturally from the retinue of huntsmen and casually conversing before his retirement into the palace. Even in the one case in Euripides in which the mechanism is most obvious, the protatic rôle gives rather than receives information; Teucer in the *Helena*, an exile from his native land, ostensibly seeks Theonoe to inquire from her the route to Cyprus, but his dialogue with Helen is a pathetic revelation to her of the ruin wrought by her wraith. The prominence of the hero in legend makes it harder for the modern reader to suffer his complete removal from the action, but the kind of information he has to give, and the necessity that it be authentic, mildly justify the choice of the character. Yet with all these apologies the mechanism is patent, and nothing saves him from being an exact prototype of the comic rôle except his

function of giving information and his social status, superior as
it is to that of the slaves who usually operate in comedy.

In the brief page of his *Plautinische Forschungen*[1] which Leo
devotes to the protatic rôle he finds in Teucer the only distinct
foreshadowing of the technique of later comedy, though he admits
that Aristophanes and tragedy faintly point the way. I should
myself decline to argue much regarding the relation of Greek comedy
to tragedy from the single phenomenon of the protatic rôle when
it is only one of many inorganic rôles that should be considered
in their entirety. But in passing I discover nothing in the evidence
that would prevent a view that the protatic rôle is a device of a
rather crude sort which dramatists, comic or tragic, are likely to
employ, quite independently of one another, and the crudity is
mitigated or emphasized in proportion to the difficulties of exposi-
tion and the skill of the dramatist. The conditions of the plot
in Euripides' *Helena* make the exposition far from easy and the
protatic rôle correspondingly mechanical. And the general com-
plexity of comic plots of intrigue makes the range of the mechani-
cal protatic rôle wider in comedy than in tragedy.

II

However closely akin Teucer in the *Helena* may be to the pro-
tatic rôles in comedy, tragedy parts company with comedy in the
mechanism of exposition beyond the opening scene. Even beyond
the first scene comedy does not hesitate to employ mechanical
and temporary rôles for expounding situation and character and
for initiating action, which Euripidean tragedy finds no occasion
to use.

The unconventional procedure of comedy is clearly illustrated
in the *Curculio*. Here Palinurus is prominent for the whole of
the first act and the first scene of the second act, only to disappear
completely as soon as the parasite, Curculio, enters the action.
In these four scenes at the beginning of the play Palinurus' rôle is
that of confidential servant, a rôle which in other plots is likely to
develop into that of arch-intriguer, or else in some lesser capacity
to continue through the play. But his actual function is simply to

---

[1] *Pl. Forsch.*[2], pp. 243–44; cf. also Legrand, *Daos*, pp. 523 ff.

listen to long exposition and to participate in preliminary action.
The mechanical nature of his rôle is made unpleasantly prominent
in so far as the situation makes it clear that he is being informed
of matters of which he is already pretty fully cognizant.   In brief,
Palinurus is a protatic rôle but with his passive part extended over
the loose exposition of four scenes.[1]

Euripides may similarly eliminate a character from the later
action of the play, but hardly in so clumsy a fashion.   Electra's
bourgeois husband in the *Electra*, after speaking the prologue,
hospitably receiving Orestes, and fetching the old servant of Aga-
memnon, disappears from the action.   But this peasant husband
is distinctly contributing both to the action and to the pathos of
the situation; his removal is justified by the circumstances of
the story, and furthermore, though the poet does withdraw him
as an active character, he is careful to restore him in an allusive
reference at the end of the play (vs. 1311).   In connection with
Electra's husband and Palinurus it is interesting to observe the
rather loose organic connection of Megaronides with the action
of the *Trinummus*.   In monologue and dialogue Megaronides, a
self-appointed *castigator*, reproaches another old man, Callicles, in the
two opening scenes of the play for supposed misdeeds; through the
responses brought out by this castigation the situation is expounded
at the beginning of the play.   Megaronides might easily have
been dropped at the end of the second scene at the conclusion of
his main function as expository rôle.   But he becomes a confidant
and assistant (vss. 189–90), and when the critical matter of the
dowry is under consideration Callicles resorts to him for advice
(vs. 614), and in a subsequent dialogue scene (vss. 729 ff.) Mega-
ronides offers definite suggestions toward the plan for securing
the dowry.   Thus he is active in only one scene beyond the expo-
sition, but the dramatist neatly restores him at the end of the play,
as Euripides does the peasant husband, by an allusive reference
in verse 1147 which gives him full credit for his share in the opera-
tions.   If he were a *servos* rather than a *senex*,[2] we should expect

[1] Cf. Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], pp. 196–97.

[2] The *uxor* in Menander's *Perinthia* could hardly have been a protatic rôle; cf.
Donatus on *And*. prol. 14.

him to disappear at the end of the expository scenes and to assume
only a protatic rôle; and as it is, he is rather loosely attached to
the plot.

Most of the rôles loosely attached to the exposition and initial
action are slaves,[1] and as such, like the same characters in other
parts of the plays, they excite little attention or adverse criticism.
But such servants, especially the female servants, *ancillae*, are often
more mechanically used near the beginning of the play than else-
where, and a few of them are worth noting as illustrations of the
loose touch-and-go method of comedy in contrast with the stricter
organism of tragedy.   Nobody objects to the *anus custos ianitrix*,
the bibulous *lena* of the *Curculio*, though she appears in only
the second and third scenes of the play and is purely picturesque
and ornamental; she does not expound the plot or listen to expo-
sition, but provokes interest and amusement by the revelation
of her own character, and suggests the entourage of Planesium.
The author of the Greek original was not sophisticated, as his
later introduction of the *choragus* attests.   More often the inor-
ganic servant near the beginning of the play contributes to the
revelation of another's character.   The *Aulularia* is a loosely woven
play;[2] the miser and his pot of gold, the betrayal of the miser's
daughter, are the two themes of the play; these are developed
into a complicated situation by the proposal of the betrayer's uncle
to marry the girl in ignorance of her relations with his nephew.
Such a situation is too slight to provide very much incident, and
the dramatist, particularly at the beginning of his play, is hard
pressed to develop action; he is driven to emphasis upon character,
and in order to interest the audience in Euclio he employs the
servant Staphyla for two scenes at the beginning of the play and
for the third scene of the second act, briefly recurring to her in
the sixth scene of the second act.   In the dialogue of these four
scenes in the first two acts the miser's character is portrayed through
the conversation with the servant, and thereafter she disappears
from the action without our missing her.   Similarly, in a succes-
sion of scenes that immediately follow in the same play, episodic

[1] Daos, in Menander's *Epitrepontes*, plays an important rôle in the arbitra-
tion scene near the beginning of the play, and does not appear later.

[2] Bonnet (*Mélanges L. Havet*, pp. 17 ff.) suspects that the play is contaminated.

cooks are introduced mainly to elaborate further the character of Euclio, although they are helpful also in filling the time of Euclio's absence from the stage. Here the free employment of temporary and loosely attached rôles is largely due to the poverty of incident in the presuppositions of the plot. The *Mostellaria*, on the contrary, is a play of action in which the complications are very neatly and compactly organized. But the exposition of the *Mostellaria* is very elaborate, constituting the whole of the first act, and includes a full portrayal of the character of four rôles as well as a full exposition of the general situation.[1] In the course of this portrayal of character the dramatist brings on a servant, Scapha, in the third scene whose sole function is, through dialogue with her young mistress, to reveal by contrast the character of the mistress; having assisted thus in character portrayal Scapha disappears from the action completely. Her removal is made less conspicuous in this instance by the further fact that all the characters in these four expository scenes, whether prominent or insignificant, are withdrawn from the action of the subsequent scenes with the exception of Tranio and Callidamates; but this withdrawal is neatly made inevitable by the conditions of the plot.

Slightly different in purpose is the use of Sophoclidisca, an *ancilla*, and Paegnium, a *puer delicatus*, in the second act of the *Persa*. Paegnium is rehabilitated in the last scene of the play, and to that extent is less casual than Sophoclidisca. In the second act, however, both are dispatched on very trivial errands for no other apparent purpose than to provide amusement in a brief series of dialogue scenes. These scenes seem to furnish relief of two sorts; as mainly song scenes they vary the form of delivery at this point; as a comic interlude they relieve the seriousness of the general situation. But the action is not advanced by their lively banter. The whole of this second act, in fact, with the exception of Sagaristio's expository monody at verses 251 ff., is mere padding for musical and comic effects.

With these loosely attached rôles in the exposition and initial action it is interesting to compare a similar temporary servant rôle in a scene that is admitted to be the result of contamination.

[1] Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XI, 140.

The prologue of Terence's *Adelphoe* states that the action in the beginning of the play in which a courtezan is stolen from a *leno* is taken from Diphilus' *Sunapothneskontes* and inserted by Terence in the action of Menander's *Adelphoi*. The precise limits of the material taken from Diphilus are a matter of dispute.[1] There is no doubt, however, that the first scene of the second act is essentially from Diphilus. Sannio, the *leno*, in this scene is active also in the three subsequent scenes of the same act; whether or not these later scenes were in Menander's play, it seems probable that a *leno* appeared in Menander's play, and in that case he was a temporary rôle but hardly inorganic. The slave Parmeno, on the other hand, who in the first scene administers punishment to the *leno* but speaks only two words, appears only in this scene; he is a slave of the household of Micio, and we should expect him to be active in behalf of Aeschinus and Ctesipho, as the slave Syrus actually is, in the rest of the play. It is, therefore, not unlikely that Parmeno is the slave who was active throughout the whole of Diphilus' play, while Syrus had the same function in Menander's play. And the fact that the temporary rôle of Parmeno is the result of contamination is manifested by his lack, in the present text of the Latin play, of any definite function such as is performed by the other servant rôles which we have just surveyed, and also by the circumstance that Syrus seems to duplicate the rôle of Parmeno for no justifiable reason.

After this general consideration we are in a better position to estimate the value of inorganic rôles in the preliminary action adduced by modern scholars as evidence of contamination or of Roman modification of any sort. The *Pseudolus* contains two such rôles in the first two acts, and the scenes in which they appear have been used to support theories that the Latin play is contaminated.[2] What I may say of these two rôles does not tend to demolish modern theories but only to establish just what degree of strength the two rôles contribute to the modern speculation. Both are free citizens, not slaves, and as such they may properly excite

[1] For details cf. Kauer's edition of the *Adelph.*, p. 14, n. 1.

[2] Cf. Bierma, *Qu. de Pl. Pseud.*, Groningen, 1897; Leo, *Nachr. d. gött. Ges.* (1903), pp. 347 ff.; Karsten, *Mnemos.*, XXXI (1903), 130 ff.; Schmitt, *De Pseud. Pl. exemplo attico*, Strassburg, 1909.

suspicion; for in the main the loosely attached rôles in the pre-
liminary action of comedy are slaves. But both have a definite
function to perform, and to that extent they are above suspicion.
In the fourth scene of the second act the arch-intriguer has arranged
his plans. For their execution he requires a sum of money and
an impostor. These two means of assistance cannot be furnished
by the young man whom the intriguer is assisting because the
conditions of the plot make it necessary that the young man should
be without funds. It is true, however, that the young man might
have obtained such assistance from a friend without the friend's
appearing on the stage. But the dramatist has chosen to bring
into the dramatic action this friend, Charinus, and from him the
five minas and the clever impostor are obtained in the course of
dialogue. Having provided the sinews of war Charinus drops out
of the action. Such trivial preliminaries to the carrying out of the
intrigue we should prefer to have dismissed in narrative of off-stage
action, but the dramatist has presented it all to us in dramatic
dialogue. Such a scene does not strengthen appreciably a theory
of contamination, although I should admit the possibility of Roman
handiwork of a different sort; for it is conceivable that the Greek
original contained a monologue by the young lover, Calidorus, in
which he narrated the fact that he had obtained the money and the
impostor from his friend; Plautus may have been averse to this
narrative, in monologue, of off-stage action and substituted dramatic
dialogue; this change in the original would exactly correspond to
the procedure of Terence at *Eunuchus* 539 ff., as we learn from
Donatus' commentary, resulting in a temporary mechanical rôle like
that of Antipho in the *Eunuchus*.[1]

The other instance in the *Pseudolus* is of a different sort. In
the fifth scene of the first act the arch-intriguer confronts his
victim, and states plainly to his victim the double-barreled trick
which he purposes to play. The dupe is an old man of stern and
irascible disposition. The dramatist adds to the scene a third
character, Callipho, another old man, but of a sweet and charitable
nature, and the contrast in character is clearly one of the reasons,
if not the main reason, for introducing him in this single scene. He

---

[1] Cf. below, p. 272.

serves also, however, as witness to the contract between the arch-intriguer and the dupe, and in verses 547 ff. he promises to stay in town and witness the course of the intrigue, and if necessary assure the fulfilment of the contract.   In spite of this definite state-ment he never reappears in the later action.   Certainly this specific promise to remain as witness of the later proceedings seems rather superfluous, and one may recall the similar superfluity in the open-ing scene of the *Andria*, in which Sosia is instructed to perform certain duties which are not realized in the subsequent action, remembering also that Sosia was not in Menander's *Andria*.   But in so far as Callipho serves to throw into sharp relief the character of the other old man in the scene, he is performing the function which, for example, Scapha serves in the *Mostellaria*, and as a mani-festation of interest in character treatment for its own sake he is a feature of Greek technique rather than of Roman fumbling in contamination.   It is, however, quite possible that he comes from one of two Greek plays in which he played more than a merely temporary rôle.

III

Callipho's function is only one instance of a general feature of Greek technique upon which I should like to enlarge at this point without regard to the part of the plot in which it appears. A recurrent phenomenon in the Roman plays is a balanced pair of characters, of the same sex or age or social status—brothers, sis-ters, old men, young men, wives, husbands, slaves.[1]   These pairs are most familiar as organic rôles, each member of the pair equally active.   Often they contribute to the manipulation of a double plot.   Of such thoroughly organic pairs the old men and the young men of the *Heautontimorumenos* and the *Phormio* and the *Adelphoe* are sufficient examples.   And it may be observed in passing that the balanced pairs of young men and of slaves in the *Andria*, though they are the result of contamination of the *Andria* and *Perinthia* of Menander,[2] can hardly serve to excite suspicion against the

---

[1] For the contrast of character in such cases cf. Legrand, *Daos*, pp. 233–34, and Siess, "Ueber d. Charakterzeichnung in d. Kom. d. Terenz," *Wiener Stud.*, XXVIII (1906), 229 ff., XXIX (1907), 81 ff.

[2] This is the older view of the matter, but recently it has been seriously ques-tioned by Leo, Schanz, and Körte; for full discussion cf. Schöll, *op. cit.*

general feature. To a considerable extent the fixed stage setting of the plays contributes to the regularity of this phase of the plots; an immovable background of houses in a city street brings together neighboring families who naturally supply balanced pairs of domestic and servile rôles.

Although in most cases both members of these pairs are equally active and organic, in some instances one member of the pair is hardly more than a foil for the other. A loosely attached member of a pair serves to set off by contrast the character of the other, who is more thoroughly an integral part of the action. Sometimes it is difficult to discover any enrichment of character treatment, and one member of a pair appears in such a case simply to increase the opportunity of dialogue, or of complex action, or of general enrichment of detail.

The various degrees in which such characters are loosely attached to the action may be illustrated by a few examples. Of the two sisters in the *Poenulus* one is distinctly more prominent than the other, and the younger, like Ismene in Sophocles' *Antigone*, is hardly more than a figure to set in relief her stronger and more important sister, though the younger sister does form a link in the weak minor plot of the Latin play. Similarly in the *Stichus* there are two sisters and wives; these two wives and sisters bring with them two brothers and husbands, two rather than one, that the parasite of the play may be twice outwitted. But one member of each of the two pairs is distinctly in the background. With the two wives and husbands of the same play come two slaves of the two households, one of whom, Sangarinus, is mere appendage to enrich the action of the convivial scene with which the play concludes. Only in the case of the wives does the weaker member of the pair appreciably enhance the portrayal of character. So, too, pairs of lovers bring pairs of sweethearts. The young men in the *Heautontimorumenos* are equally active and organic, but of the two sweethearts in the same play Antiphila appears in only a single scene and there simply to set in bold relief the mercenary courtezan, Bacchis, in contrast with her own refinement and sweetness. In the *Bacchides*, again, the two young men are equally active and organic. But of the two old men, their fathers, Nicobulus, against

whom the main intrigue is developed, is so much more intimately connected with the main thread of action that the other old man, Philoxenus, seems at times to be little more than filling; he fills out the symmetry of two sisters, two young lovers, two old roués. In so doing he is, of course, available for economic purposes of dialogue, of incidental linking of minor chapters of action, of character contrast, and of general enrichment. The two sisters, also, appear in only the opening and concluding scenes of the play, and of them one is a background figure like Anterastilis in the *Poenulus*. At the end of the elaborate exposition of the *Mostellaria* the dramatist introduces a lyrical intermezzo to re-enforce the convivial atmosphere of the opening situation. In this convivial scene the young lover and his sweetheart, already elaborately presented in introductory scenes, are joined by two convivial chums, Callidamates and Delphium; they are a pair, matching the young hero and heroine of the piece. Callidamates appears later in the play, for comic effects in the scene immediately following and as a mechanical agent in the solution of difficulties at the end. But Delphium, except for slight activity in the next scene, concludes her rôle in this short convivial scene. Her function is simply to assist in the humorous effects of the drunken revel, to fill up the stage, and perhaps to contribute to the volume and variety of song. In the peculiar structure of the *Mostellaria* even the hero and heroine are completely removed from the action after the exposition, so that we accept very easily the removal of Delphium, a weak member of the pair that balances the more prominent couple of lovers.

By grouping together these examples of a general feature of the technique of comedy I have intended to indicate the loose touch-and-go method of the literary type in respect to the various degrees of stability revealed in pairs and balanced pairs of characters. Whatever starting-point one may find for such procedure in an occasional case like that of Antigone and Ismene in Sophocles is, I think, soon lost sight of in the informal way in which comedy secures various effects by the loose attachment to the plot of at least one member of a pair. Among the economic purposes served by the device character treatment is not the least important, and the strength of Callipho in the *Pseudolus* as a link in the chain

of evidence which binds together the theory of contamination is
weakened, though not destroyed, by considering him in this con-
nection.   But the important point is that in the use of loosely
attached rôles to promote the portrayal of character[1] the Latin
plays are only appropriating or continuing the technique of their
Greek originals.

IV

In leaving the exposition and initial action of the plays and
passing to the main action some general introductory statements
may prevent misunderstanding.   In this part of the drama par-
ticularly, be it tragedy or comedy, temporary characters are not
necessarily inorganic.   I assume that nobody is disturbed if the
prophet Teiresias comes and goes in a single scene of the *Oedipus
Rex*, having as prophet performed his function, especially as the
audience has been duly prepared for his appearance.   Nor should
Pheres' temporary activity in a single scene of the *Alcestis* of Euripi-
des exemplify the use of inorganic rôles; for, again, earlier action
prepares us for his coming, his behavior admirably contributes to
the portrayal of Alcestis and Admetus by way of contrast, and
his permanent disappearance is an inevitable result of his conduct.
Even in the earliest form of tragedy, in which we might look for
loose structure, temporary rôles are few in number and rarely
mechanical.   Io's appearance in the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus is
somewhat opportune; as a mythical globe-trotter she may turn up
anywhere, and as a fellow-sufferer with Prometheus at the hands
of Zeus she appears appropriately if somewhat mechanically.   Tra-
gedy, of course, operates freely with servants and similar minor
characters.   Appearing infrequently and for short intervals they
serve economic purposes, running errands, bringing news, in various
ways linking minor paragraphs of the action.   Such minor rôles
may at any moment be mechanically employed; obviously so in
the case of the servant in Euripides' *Hecuba*, who is sent for water
to wash the body of Polyxena and opportunely discovers the corpse
of Polydorus.   In this instance we are immediately aware that the
poet has somewhat arbitrarily bound together two unrelated chap-
ters of the action which he unwisely chose to unite in a single play.

[1] Cf. above, p. 247, for the protatic rôle as instrumental in portraying character.

But even Euripides, in spite of a multitude of servants, heralds, messengers, is seldom very mechanical in his technique, although the tragic messenger is often arbitrarily employed. Euripides does, however, indulge in a few episodic rôles and scenes for somewhat spectacular effect. Special conditions render them good of their sort, and they are as closely knit to the main action as such scenes admit: so, for instance, the spectacular appearance of Iris and Madness in the *Hercules Furens*, the Phrygian who escapes from the general slaughter in the *Orestes*, the Evadne and Iphis scene in the *Supplices*, which illustrates by a concrete example the general pathos of the larger situation. In these cases some may agree with the author of the hypothesis to the *Phoenissae*, who commenting on the teichoscopy near the beginning of the play asserts that it is not essential to the action. In general the organic steadiness of Greek tragedy is remarkable. And as a part of its general stability temporary rôles are very few, and seldom mechanically employed.

The Latin comedies, on the contrary, use a very large number of temporary rôles; most of these rôles are organic; a few, however, are strikingly mechanical. The profusion of temporary rôles may be suggested by a brief survey of the material, with passing comment on those that are in various degrees mechanical.

Comedy presents an array of servants, *servi* and *ancillae*. Even those who are active for only a small part of one scene, like Crocotium in the *Stichus*, do not disturb the most sophisticated; Dromo is slightly more active in the *Heautontimorumenos;* Cyamus is active in a single scene of the *Truculentus;* Syra in the *Mercator* passes on and off the stage in the fourth act; Dorias and Pythias, on the other hand, are almost permanent rôles in the *Eunuchus*. Seldom do such servants contribute much to the main action, though Mysis in the *Andria* is manipulated by the arch-intriguer into promoting his trick, and Halisca in the *Cistellaria* in her brief existence manages to lose opportunely the casket of trinkets, to this extent being distinctly a bit of the dramatist's wirepulling. We are prepared for Stephanium in the *Stichus*, but she is loosely appended to enliven the convivial party of slaves in the last act. The case of Sosia in *Hecyra* 415 ff. is unique; this slave suddenly

appears without warning, and disappears after fifteen verses of
dialogue with Parmeno in which he discourses briefly on the incon-
veniences of a sea voyage. Donatus,[1] sensitive to the irrelevance
of the character and his utterances, remarks that your true poet
considers, not only the plot, but the necessity of entertaining the
audience, and he dignifies this part of the scene as a εὕρημα of the
perfectus poeta. Donatus may be right. Incidentally, it may be
observed, this temporary and mechanical activity of Sosia saves
the dramatist the necessity of bringing Parmeno on the stage with
a monologue after the very extended monologue of Pamphilus
that immediately precedes.[2]

Among the slaves most freely used for quite incidental pur-
poses are the *pueri*. These *pueri* include not only the παῖδες,
familiar to readers of Aristophanes, but a special type of hand-
some young voluptuaries, known as *pueri delicati*, who are on inti-
mate terms with their masters and are conventionalized as pert
youngsters furnishing entertainment with their saucy wit. Along
with certain cooks and parasites these *pueri delicati* are the clowns
and jesters of comedy, and as such are specially prone to fill inor-
ganic rôles and to provide irrelevant material in solo speeches or
somewhat extended dialogue; and often the scenes in which they
appear are sung rather than spoken or recited. In brief they are
ornamental accessories to the action, and their names often sug-
gest a physical attractiveness. The scene headings and text are
not always explicit; the *puer delicatus* can usually be recognized
from the nature of his talk, but the slave boys used for very limited
and incidental purposes are probably *pueri* in the broader and
more general sense. Frag. x (xvii) of the *Bacch.* is generally referred
to a *puer*, who is perhaps accompanying the younger Bacchis to

---

[1] On *Hec.* 415: "alia ratio est currentis ad argumenta, alia actuum comicorum;
sed perfecti poetae est ita servire argumento ut tamen spectator novis delectation-
ibus teneatur. nam in hac scaena, donec perveniat ad Pamphilum Parmeno, hoc
εὕρημα inducitur cum ostenditur quid mali sit navigatio." Similarly, commenting on
the realistic character of the remarks of Lesbia, the *obstetrix*, in *And.* 481 ff. Donatus
says: "et haec sunt praeter οἰκονομίαν quae dicuntur εὑρήματα." Lesbia is temporary
but prepared for in earlier action, as is not the case with Sosia.

[2] Parmeno, of course, might enter without a monologue, immediately discover-
ing Pamphilus. But the technique of entrance more often provides the entering
character with a monologue when another character is already on stage.

her sister's house, and in verse 577 of the same play another *puer*, as a silent rôle, accompanies the parasite. *Poen.* 1141 contains two Punic words ascribed by Angelius to a *puer*, and in *Curc.* 390 the words *sequere me* are supposed by the editors to be addressed to a *puer* accompanying Curculio, though I shall later suggest a different interpretation.[1] These *pueri* just mentioned illustrate how incidental the rôle may be, limited to a word or two, or even silent, as is the *puer* who accompanies Ballio in the first act of the *Pseudolus* (vss. 170, 241–42, 249, 252, 263). The *puer* of *Most.* 420 is dignified with a name, Sphaerio, but he simply brings a key out of the house and speaks only a couple of verses.

Over against these very casual cases stands a more interesting group of *pueri* who, though temporary, are more talkative, and who are usually made to facilitate the structure of the play by serving economic purposes. Most of these are *pueri delicati*. Paegnium in the *Persa* is weakly brought into the action by a very trivial errand, but once on the stage he provides patter-talk that pads the second act and provides a comic interlude mainly in lyrical measures.[2] In the last act of the play he returns to increase the discomfiture of the *leno* and to add to the gaiety and volume of song in the carousal of slaves. Pinacium in the *Stichus* is brought on as a messenger for two scenes of the second act, and in song and recitative shares with the parasite the rôle of buffoon. The news brought by Pinacium is important but his main function is entertainment. The same patter-talk is provided by the two *pueri delicati* of the *Mostellaria* 858 ff. in solo and duet. Like the characters of the *Persa* and the *Stichus* they have significant names, Pinacium and Phaniscus. Not only, however, are they entertaining but they fill with a sung interlude the absence of Theopropides from the stage. And though they are essentially inorganic rôles, the author has done his best to attach them as closely as possible to the action. The problem which the dramatist had to solve in this case was just how to bring about the peripety, the disclosure to Theopropides of the fact that he had been tricked, and the consequent disaster to Tranio's

[1] Cf. below, p. 270, n. 1.

[2] Though Leo in general regards song as Plautine in form rather than Greek, he admits (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 120) the possibility that in the *Persa* there was song in the Greek original.

intrigue.   For this purpose he brings on the *pueri*, one of whom
ultimately (vss. 952 ff.) makes the real facts known to Theopropi-
des.   The previous action did not supply any organic character
who could make this disclosure.   Such a lugging on of characters
for the mere purpose of forcing the peripety is distinctly mechani-
cal, but it is to be observed that Philemon at least took care to
prepare for the ultimate appearance of these *pueri* by having Calli-
damates in verse 313 address them and order them to meet him
after his carousal.   The technique of the Greek poet, if rather
weak, is very interesting, particularly his use of relatively mechani-
cal rôles to bring about a reversal and his further use of the rôles
to serve the economic purpose of time-filling.   So the *puer deli-
catus* of *Pseud.* 767 ff. (not to be identified with the *puer* of the
first act) not only entertains the audience with his monologue but
by his irrelevant account of the hardship incident to his lot occupies
the stage while the actor who plays the part of Pseudolus assumes
the rôle of Ballio; and, with the cook scene that immediately fol-
lows, this *puer* scene fills the interval of Pseudolus' absence with
the padding of buffoonery.[1]   In this brief monologue the *puer
delicatus* makes his only appearance, although he remains on stage
in the cook scene and perhaps speaks verses 891–92 as Bothe sup-
poses.   The equally short existence of the *pueri* in *Capt.* 909 ff.
and *Miles* 1378 ff. is purely to the economic advantage of the struc-
ture.   These slaves are not demonstrably *pueri delicati*.   The *puer's*
monologue in the *Captivi* helps to fill the interval of Hegio's absence,
and the fact that Ergasilus' monologue in verse 901 was not alone
sufficient to fill this interval indicates that the *puer* was brought
on in order that the actor who played Ergasilus' rôle might assume
another rôle in the first scene of the last act.[2]   So, too, at *Miles*
1388 ff. the *puer's* short monologue covers the time of the soldier's
absence, and the *puer* is introduced in verse 1378 in the rôle of go-
between, hitherto filled by Milphidippa, perhaps because the actor
who played Milphidippa's rôle is needed for a different part in the
final act, which with its five rôles taxes the powers of a limited cast.[3]

[1] For the details of the argument for change of rôles, cf. *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*,
XXI (1910), 39 ff.

[2] Cf. *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXI (1910), 37 ff.

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 34 ff.

This comprehensive account of the regularity with which
inorganic or loosely attached *pueri* are employed to entertain the
audience and to meet the exigencies that arise from the necessity
of filling time intervals and facilitating change of rôles[1] makes it
possible for us to weigh more intelligently the value of the Lurcio
scene in *Miles* 813 ff. as a support for the theory of contamination
usually advanced to explain the structure of that play.[2] At the
outset we must admit that Lurcio may be not a *puer* in any strict
sense; the scene headings so style him, but the text of the scene
refers to him as a *subpromus*, or assistant butler (vss. 825, 837, 846).
In any case he is a minor slave. The striking features of this scene
are these: (1) Palaestrio standing before the house of the *miles*
calls out Sceledrus; in the place of Sceledrus Lurcio appears repre-
senting that Sceledrus has gone to sleep in his cups, and in the
dialogue that follows at some length there is nothing said to advance
the action, though it may entertain the audience. Lurcio has
not been mentioned before, and he plays no part subsequently;
in verses 859 ff., apprehensive of what may happen to him if the
soldier returns, he invents, apparently, an errand that takes him
away from the house, and, though Palaestrio bids him return quickly,
he never reappears. The character, therefore, is absolutely inorganic
and mechanical. (2) If there were need of any such padding for the
mere purpose of entertainment, the requirements would be met
just as easily if Sceledrus himself appeared and entertained the
audience in drunken dialogue.[3] Of these two features the first,

---

[1] Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], p. 227, n. 3 (bottom of p. 228), says with reference to the
monologues of the *puer*, and of the parasite in the *Capt.*, and of the *choragus* in the
Curc., "dass die Form griechisch ist, kann man nicht bezweifeln." In other words,
they do not take the place of a Menandrian χοροῦ, but were spoken interludes in
the Greek original as in the Roman copy.

[2] Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], pp. 178 ff., and for earlier bibliography, *ibid.*, p. 178, n. 3;
for later discussion, Franke, *De Mil. Glor. Pl. compositione*, Leipzig, 1910, and Mesk,
Wiener Stud., XXXV (1914), 211 ff.

[3] Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 183, and other students of contamination in the *Miles* are, I
think, in error in finding any contradiction between the situation implied in the
Lurcio scene, during which Sceledrus is supposed to be sleeping off a debauch in
the soldier's house, and verses 582, 585, 593. For it is not only unnecessary to take
foris in verse 593 as meaning "out of the soldier's house," but a consideration of
the style in this verse makes it quite unlikely that it does have this meaning. Peri-
plectomenus, in verses 592 ff., is thinking of the approaching council in which he
himself, Pleusicles, and Palaestrio are to participate. He says: "redeo in senatum

taken by itself, can easily be matched, not only by analogous *puer*
scenes which we have already discussed, but by scenes in which
other inorganic rôles such as cooks, or the *choragus* of the *Curculio*,
are mechanically introduced for a single scene to furnish amuse-
ment.   And it should be noted that the Lurcio scene, like so many
of the other corresponding scenes, not only provides comic byplay
but helps to fill the absence of Periplectomenus from the stage;
he left at verse 805 and returns at verse 874.   But in this case
verses 805–12 of our text also fill this interval, and although eight
verses are rather few for the filling of such an interval, it may
be contended that the Lurcio scene is not absolutely necessary
as a stop-gap.   The second of the two features, viz., that Lurcio
seems to play a rôle that might as well be played by Sceledrus,
immediately leads to the suggestion that the same actor played
the rôles of both Pleusicles and Sceledrus;   Pleusicles leaves the
stage just before the Lurcio scene begins, and this prevents the
appearance of Sceledrus in the present scene.   Such a suggestion
cannot be made into any convincing explanation, although it
is worth remarking that the activity of Sceledrus ends with the
appearance of Pleusicles in the action, and that Sceledrus returns
to the stage only in the last scene of the play after Pleusicles has
left the action.   Briefly put, the function of Lurcio as an inorganic
puer, providing entertainment and padding the interval of time
during the departure and return of the same character, and, pos-
sibly, as a means of extricating the dramatist from difficulties due
to a limited cast, makes him a weaker support for a theory of con-
tamination than has generally been realized;   but thereby I do not
mean to say that in combination with other dubious features of

------

rusum; nam Palaestrio / domi nunc apud me est, Sceledrus nunc autemst foris."
Anybody so sensitive as Leo to the construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ should have appreciated
the antithesis between *domi* . . . . *apud me* at the beginning of verse 593 and *foris*
at the end of the same verse;   clearly we are to understand the equivalent of *apud
me* with *foris;*   and Periplectomenus says: "Palaestrio is now *at my house*, Sceledrus
on the other hand is now *out of my house*." This statement completely accords
with the situation of the Lurcio scene.   And verses 582–85 are in harmony, too;
for there Sceledrus first thinks of flight (vs. 582), then changes his mind and decides
to go home to the soldier's house (vs. 585), where we find him in the Lurcio scene.
With Sceledrus out of Periplectomenus' house permanently, now that Palaestrio
has thoroughly scared him, the council can proceed without danger of interruption.

the environing scenes the Lurcio scene may not be fairly used as evidence of botching of some sort. It is clear that verses 870 ff. might immediately follow verse 812; it is clear, too, that verses 807–9 contain provisions of which no use is made later in the play. These and other intricate features of the text do not encourage dogmatic opinions regarding the Lurcio scene.

The *nutrix* is usually employed to assist in recognition, and in that connection will interest us later in the discussion of the solution of the plot. The temporary activity of Canthara in the early action of the *Adelphoe* is above criticism.

Cooks, particularly, play a large part as temporary rôles. The cook may have a very slight rôle, as does Chytrio in the *Casina*, the cook in the *Curculio*, and Cario, somewhat strangely lugged on in the last scene of the *Miles* to brandish the carving knife. More often he holds the stage for a scene for comic effects of a broad sort. Seldom does he advance the action as does the cook of the *Mercator* by betraying the old man's secret. The cooks of the *Aulularia*, as we have seen, help reveal the character of Euclio, and also fill the interval of Euclio's absence from the stage. And this time-filling function, along with the broadest comic effects, is patent in the case of the cook of the *Pseudolus* 790 ff., whose dialogue with Ballio, in combination with the monologue of the *puer* at verses 767 ff., fills the interval of Pseudolus' absence from the stage. In these entertaining scenes the cook is inorganic from a modern standpoint, in so far as he occupies much space with irrelevant subject-matter, but it is important to observe how often the dramatist makes him serve economical purposes. Even in the *Curculio*, as has been recently suggested,[1] the cook may facilitate change of rôles.

Professional types of various sorts occupy the stage for a scene or two, usually without disturbing the organic unity of the play.[2] Even so brief an appearance as that of the *obstetrix*, Lesbia, in

---

[1] Conrad, *Class. Phil.*, XIII, 389 ff.

[2] Here may be noted the professional groups of *advocati* and *piscatores*. The *advocati* of the *Poenulus* are essential to the action, but those of the *Phormio* owe their temporary existence only to the comic possibilities of their delightful egotism. The *piscatores* of the *Rudens* supply a brief interlude that relieves the seriousness of the environing scenes and provides local color.

the *Andria* may pass unchallenged.[1]   Longer activity, of the money-
lenders in the *Epidicus* and the *Mostellaria*, of the banker in
the *Curculio*, of the *leno* in the *Phormio*, of the *sycophanta* in the
Trinummus, of the *medicus* in the *Menaechmi*, the *mercator* in the
Asinaria, the priestess in the *Rudens*, is in these cases never episodic;
the characters are properly introduced, advance the action, and
disappear naturally after their function is performed.[2]   The *paeda-
gogus* of the *Bacchides* is less inevitable than some of the professional
characters, but he serves to bring Philoxenus into the action of
the play, and by his elaboration of the disciplinary mode of educa-
tion both entertains the audience and by contrast illuminates the
easy-going and charitable father, Philoxenus.   The *miles* is occa-
sionally a temporary rôle, as in the *Bacchides* and the *Epidicus*,
but with very definite functions and satisfactorily introduced and
dismissed.   With such a *miles*, however, there sometimes appears
a *parasitus* who is much more loosely attached to the action.   In
the *Miles* this parasite, or flatterer, is a protatic rôle and has already
been discussed.   In the *Eunuchus*, though he is far from a merely
temporary rôle, he is loosely attached, like most buffoon rôles, and
provides comic relief to an otherwise serious situation; and even
if Gnatho comes from the *Kolax* of Menander into the plot of the
Eunuchus, Struthias in the *Kolax* could hardly have played a more
organic rôle.   In the *Bacchides* the parasite appears in verses 573 ff.
without any previous announcement, introduces himself in very
mechanical style, and disappears after a short dialogue with Pis-
toclerus, having performed his errand and occasioned some amusing
billingsgate.   One naturally objects that the *miles* himself might
as well have appeared at this point; as it is, the *miles* appears
later at verse 842.   Of course the unsuccessful errand of the parasite
forecasts the sure arrival of the *miles*, and perhaps some desirable
suspense is thereby created.   It may be worth noting, again, that
the scene in which the parasite appears provides filling for the inter-
val between Mnesilochus' exit at verse 572 and his re-entrance

[1] On Lesbia, cf. above, p. 261, n. 1.   She passes on and off the stage much as
the cook in the *Samia* of Menander, verses 68 ff.   And she is a Menandrian rôle;
cf. Lindskog, *Studien zum antiken Drama*, Miscellen II, pp. 11 ff., and Körte, *Hermes*,
XLIV, 311 ff.

[2] The part of the *Amphitruo* in which Blepharo, the *gubernator*, appeared is
fragmentary; his rôle was temporary but duly prepared for in verses 951, 967.

at verse 612. As often, the inorganic rôle serves an economic purpose. The parasite who turns up with Diabolus in the last two acts of the *Asinaria* could be easily eliminated without loss to the action except for the fact that he makes it possible for Diabolus to come on the stage in verses 746 ff. talking with somebody instead of soliloquizing, and the reading of the letter by the parasite, with correction and comment by Diabolus, makes an effective scene; the parasite's further activity is perhaps sufficiently justified in verses 820 ff. The rôle of Diabolus is really the peculiar feature of technique at this point, as we shall later see, and the casual use of the parasite is largely a sequel to the late introduction of Diabolus, who under the conditions of the plot has nobody with whom to converse unless a character is specially devised for the purpose.

With the exception of Gnatho in the *Eunuchus* the parasites under discussion have been incidental and very temporary rôles. From them we may pass to other parasites, who, like Gnatho, have a more extended rôle but are flatly inorganic. In a few cases the rôle is permanent and organic, and the parasite is the protagonist as in the *Curculio* and *Phormio*. In the *Persa* the parasite Saturio is an important agent in the intrigue, though his active participation is slight in extent.[1] Even these organic parasites reveal, as an incidental feature of their equipment, what is more prominent in the cases of inorganic parasites; they are buffoon rôles, like the cooks, and as entertaining clowns they are not subject to the conventions of dramatic technique. So Peniculus in the *Menaechmi*, Ergasilus in the *Captivi*, and Gelasimus in the *Stichus* are in different degrees professional entertainers and loosely attached rôles, active through several scenes of the play, and in the case of Ergasilus lasting to the very end of the drama. They are attached to the action through their dependence for food and living on the household of one of the main characters; in the case of Gelasimus this connection is left very vague at the opening of action so that the parasite's first appearance is weakly motivated.[2] The

---

[1] On the elimination of Saturio from the carousal at the end of the play cf. *Class. Phil.*, XI, 129, and n. 2.

[2] Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XI, 136 ff.

contribution of all these entertainers to the development of action is slight; Peniculus vents his disappointment at missing a meal by fetching the wronged wife to the scene of her husband's faithlessness, and Ergasilus serves as a messenger to bring the news that solves the complications of the *Captivi;* similarly Gelasimus is summoned to serve as messenger, but his function is usurped by a *puer,* so that the summons seems merely a device to get him on the stage.   Aside from these slight points of contact with the actual plot these rôles simply amuse the audience with extended passages of irrelevant material concerning their ups and downs in the precarious following of their profession.   Often these passages take the form of extended monologues, and in such cases the inorganic rôle and the irrelevant material subserve the convenience of the poet in constructing his action, particularly in the matter of filling intervals of time.   So the monologue of Peniculus in *Men.* 446 ff. fills the gap between the departure and return of the second Menaechmus; the two monologues of Ergasilus at *Capt.* 461 ff. and 768 ff. occupy the interval of Hegio's absence from the stage; and Ergasilus' monologue at 901 ff. in combination with a monologue by a *puer* bridges a similar gap, and at the same time facilitates change of rôles.[1]   The whole fabric of the *Stichus,* however, is so loosely woven that no such economic use of Gelasimus is necessary, and he is left to the elaboration of his comical propensities.

The economic advantage of the inorganic professional rôle is nowhere more patent than in the case of the *choragus* of *Curculio* 462 ff.   Here there suddenly appears without warning, and for a single scene of lengthy solo speech, the costumer or property man. His main function is clear when we note that the same three characters are on the stage before and after his soliloquy; he is clearly filling a gap which probably the dramatist could not easily cover by the use of organic rôles.   In brief, his function is like that of the chorus of Greek drama.   His speech is wholly irrelevant but entertaining;   he informs   the audience where in Rome they may find various typical characters, moral and professional types.

---

[1] Cf. Leo as quoted above, p. 264, n. 1, on the Greek technique in these features of the *Captivi.*

The Roman content of his speech suggests at once Plautine invention. No doubt Plautus is responsible for the words of the monologue, but it is by no means certain that the same character did not play the same rôle with different words in the Greek original.[1] The

[1] The point, though small, is of some importance, and I briefly sketch the frail argument in favor of a view that Plautus is not inventing the rôle or its function even if he is responsible for the content of most of the speech. (1) It is not so certain, as is usually assumed, that the character and the speech are absolutely detachable from the environing action. The first two verses may indicate that the choragus has been present during the previous scene; how else should he know that Curculio, now rigged out in the *ornamenta* which the choragus has supplied, is a *lepidus nugator ?* With this in mind, if we note verse 390 in which Curculio says (to somebody who is not identifiable either in the text or in the scene heading) *sequere me*, we may well ask if the person thus addressed is not the choragus instead of a slave boy as the editors usually assert. In this case the choragus appeared with Curculio at verse 384, and is consequently linked to the action of the previous scene as a silent rôle. If Plautus had been himself inventing a rôle and a speech to take the place of a *chorou*, as we find it in the papyrus of Menander, or of a vacant stage or any other stop-gap in the Greek original, he would hardly have taken the trouble to connect the episodic character with the preceding scene. (2) These first two verses contain the dubious word *halophantam*, which, with the apparent assonance in *sycophantam* and possible punning in the two words, points to a Greek source rather than Plautine invention so far as these two verses are concerned. (3) The Greek word *choragus* in the scene heading cannot be pressed unless we are convinced that Plautus is responsible for the scene heading. It appears in the same Doric form in the text of *Persa* 159, *Trin.* 858. It is conceivable that Plautus got the word, not from his Greek original, but from the parlance of the stage in Magna Graecia. On the other hand, the fact that it is choragus, not choregus, need not militate against its having been in the scene heading or the text of the Greek original; for in the *Captivi* we have *Alide* for *Elide*. But I do not know of clear cases of the Greek words, *choregus* or *choragus*, used in the Hellenistic period of the costumer; the costumer is called ἱματιομίσθης in Pollux vii. 78; cf. 2563–66 in Collitz-Bechtel, *Samml. d. Dialekt-Inschr.*, II. Such a passage as Antiphanes, frag. 204, verses 5–6, indicates how easily the *choregus* of the fifth century might have led to the use of the noun *choregus* in later Greek of the costumer. In Donatus' comment on *Eun.* 967 the *choragus* seems to be a stage manager. The persistency of choragus and choragium (cf. *Capt.* 61) down to a late period in Latin (cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat., s. vv.*) seems to me to point to the influence of the Greek colonies in Southern Italy as determining the form of the word, and I am disposed to think that even in Plautus' time the form of the word and the denotation of it were already naturalized in Latin. Cf. Fredershausen, *De iure Pl. et Terentiano*, p. 68. (4) The violation of the dramatic illusion by bringing in a stage hand, mechanic, musician, is entirely in the spirit of the old comedy in Greece, although extended speeches by such rôles are not found in the Greek type; usually it takes the form of address to such stage hands. So, e.g., cf. Aristoph. *Peace* 173 ff. and frag. 188 for the *mechanopoios;* Aristoph. *Birds* 659 ff., 676 ff., *Eccl.* 891 ff. for the *auletes;* and so in Plautus *Pseud.* 573, *Stich.* 715 ff., 758 ff. And the introduction of the stage manager into the action of the drama is familiar to readers of Sanscrit dramatic literature as well as to those who have seen the modern production of "The Yellow Jacket" after a Chinese model. (5) Fraenkel, *De med. et nov. com. qu. sel.*, pp. 98 ff., parallels from Greek sources the cataloguing of classes of citizens, and the use of a word like *commostrabo* in such an enumeration.

informal speech to the audience and the content of the remarks seem like survivals of the Aristophanic parabasis.[1]

The main action of the plays is carried on by intriguing slaves and parasites, and by domestic rôles, the *senes, matronae, adulescentes*. It is seldom that such domestic rôles are loosely attached to the action; as the main rôles they are generally organic. In the *Stichus*, to be sure, we have an isolated play in which almost all the characters, including even the main rôles, are active only for a short time; the wives appear only in the opening scenes; the husbands are prominent only in the middle of the play; the slaves rule the stage in the last act. Whether this is the result of contamination or of a temporary eccentricity on Menander's part may not be clear, but in any case it is exceptional.[2] So, too, the technique of the *Mostellaria* is unique in so far as the young lover and his sweetheart are eliminated after the exposition, but the elimination is artistically managed.[3] In general domestic rôles are permanent and organic. Many of them, however, are temporary without being at all loosely attached; like the similar professional rôles they are properly introduced and depart, after they have performed their function, without exciting any unfavorable comment. So, for example, Eunomia in the *Aulularia*, the *senex* of the *Menaechmi*, Sostrata and Hegio in the *Adelphoe*, Aristophontes in the *Captivi*, although active for only a scene or two, are not missed when they disappear from the action. Charmides, a *senex* in the *Rudens*, is much less inevitable than most temporary domestic rôles. He is carefully introduced in the exposition and is active in three scenes of the second and third acts. His chief function seems to be to provide dialogue in the first scene in which he appears, and throughout the scenes to throw a damaging light upon the character of Labrax. The structure of the *Rudens* is in general so loose that, I think, Charmides is only another example of the individual technique of the Greek author, Diphilus. The only example of a thoroughly inorganic domestic rôle in this part of

---

[1] Even Leo admits that the spoken interlude as a stop-gap is Greek; cf. above, p. 264, n. 1.

[2] Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XI, 136 ff., and Enk, *Mnemos.*, XLIV (1916), 18 ff.

[3] Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XI, 140.

the action is Antipho in the *Eunuchus*, and it is very important to observe that in this case the rôle is definitely ascribed to Roman craftsmanship by Donatus on verse 539.[1] At this point in the play the young man, Chaerea, having assumed the dress of a eunuch, has succeeded in his amour with a young girl, and comes rushing out of the house in which his trick has been successfully executed. In the Greek original by Menander, as we infer from Donatus' note, the young man narrated in monologue what had taken place within the house, and then repaired to a friend's house to remove his disguise. But Terence, to avoid a long monologue, has this friend appear on the stage in the person of Antipho, who after referring to a party at which the young lover was expected but has not yet appeared is confronted by Chaerea himself as the latter rushes from the girl's house. To Antipho the lover narrates his successful intrigue with the girl, and then, reminded of his engagement at the dinner party, repairs to Antipho's house to get rid of his disguise. In other words Antipho did not appear in the Greek original but has been rudely lugged on the stage by Terence to avoid a lengthy monologue by Chaerea reporting off-stage action. The significance of this procedure is clear. We are justified in suspecting as evidence of Terentian, and possibly of Roman, workmanship any inorganic rôle whose exclusive function is to promote dialogue and obviate monologue.[2] And this principle I have already ventured to apply in suggesting that Sosia in the *Eunuchus* and Charinus in the *Pseudolus* may be cases of Roman intervention; in applying the principle in the latter case I have, of course, perhaps unwisely, extended the application to Plautus, of whose aversion to solo narrative of off-stage action we have no evidence.

The striking features, therefore, of the technique in the course of the main action are the relative profusion, as compared with

[1] "Bene inventa persona est cui narret Chaerea, ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum."

[2] Strictly speaking, the passage in Donatus suggests only that Terence is on occasion averse to long monologue narrating off-stage action. Plautus does not seem to resent any kind of solo speech. But there are conditions under which dialogue enhances the effect, and occasionally one may suspect that an inorganic rôle is loosely attached even in the Greek original to promote dialogue; cf. above, on the parasite in the *Asin.*, p. 268. For the reverse process in Terence—substitution of monologue for dialogue—cf. Donatus on *Hecyra* 825.

tragedy, of temporary rôles, the employment of a few mechanical
or loosely attached rôles among this number for the purpose of
assisting in portrayal of character, of entertaining the audience
with irrelevant buffoonery, of filling time and facilitating changes
of rôles, and, rarely, of promoting dialogue. So far as the pro-
fusion of temporary rôles is concerned, the difference between
comedy and tragedy is not very significant; for this difference is
simply due to different conditions in the tragic and comic situations
and plots. Tragedy deals usually with the misadventures of a
single household and of a princely family. This royal or heroic
entourage has little contact with the larger plebeian community,
and such contact as it does have is immediately realized in the
dramatic action through the presence of the chorus, which is usually
made up of members of the community. Comedy, on the other
hand, sets its scene in a city street with two or three households
in the background. These plebeian families are intimately asso-
ciated with the activities of other households, not represented in
the stage setting, and of business life in the forum and market.
But there is no chorus. With a fixed background of several houses
and no chorus the dramatist is driven to the use of some temporary
rôles to bring about the natural interaction of the outer business
life of the city and the intimate life of several families.

Furthermore, the absence of a chorus deprives the comic poet
of easy means to provide stop-gaps in the action such as he needs.
And his need is imperative if he is obliged to prepare a play for
presentation by a limited cast. For obviously, if a dozen rôles
must be played by half a dozen actors, the interweaving of chap-
ters of action is increasingly difficult. There is every temptation
to fill a gap by lugging on an otherwise unoccupied actor for a
mechanical part and an irrelevant episode. Time for off-stage
action and for allowing other members of the cast to shift their
parts is thereby easily secured. Yet I hope that nobody will quickly
seize upon the several clear cases in which inorganic rôles perform
a choral function as evidence that either Hellenistic or Roman
comedy is necessarily an issue from choral drama. All that the
evidence indicates is that all dramatists have difficulties in pro-
viding stop-gaps to bridge intervals of time. Choral drama easily

meets the situation.   Non-choral drama has to achieve the same
end through the actors on the stage, and is driven to devices of
various sorts, among which inorganic and loosely attached rôles
and irrelevant padding are conspicuous, if the artists are not highly
skilled and sophisticated.   It still remains possible, of course, that
an inorganic chorus in Menander might have been replaced on
occasion in Roman comedy by an inorganic rôle, but there is no
case in which the conditions point clearly to such a substitution.
The nearest approach to such a case is the *choragus* of the *Cur-
culio*.   Broadly speaking, the technique in question is probably
Greek.   And if Greek technique, it argues against the uniform
employment in Hellenistic comedy of such an inorganic chorus as
the papyrus of Menander provides for time-filling purposes.[1]

V

As the dramatist approaches the end of his play he may still
have difficulty in providing for time intervals and in facilitating
change of rôles.   The scenes in which the *pueri* appear in the *Mos-
tellaria*, and the *puer* scenes of the *Captivi* and *Miles*, all of which
have been discussed in the previous section of this paper, come
just before the last act.   But in general the difficulties that con-
front the poet in the peripety and in the solution of the compli-
cations are concerned not so much with lapse of time and change
of rôles as with the mere problem of bringing about the required
turn in the action at the peripety and at the solution of compli-
cations.   So the *pueri* scene at *Most.* 858 ff., although it does fill
neatly an interval of time, brings on the stage somewhat mechani-
cally the agents who are to disclose the truth to Theopropides and
thereby achieve the reversal of Tranio's good fortune.   The temp-
tation to which the poet sometimes succumbs near the end of his
play lies in the introduction of a new rôle, not hitherto employed,
for the express purpose either of forcing a reversal of the action
or mechanically solving the complications of his plot.

Greek tragedy, to some extent, illustrates the difficulties.   The
inorganic messenger is freely employed to report the gruesome

[1] The pederastic implications of the content of the scenes in which *pueri delicati*
appear stamp them as Greek; cf. Prehn, *Qu. Plaut.*, Breslau, 1916, chap. v.

catastrophe that ends the drama, and the *deus ex machina* some-
times rudely cuts the knot of complications. Aside from these
recognized phenomena of tragedy, however, there is seldom any
introduction of ordinary characters late in the play for temporary
and mechanical purposes. The Pythian priestess in the *Ion* of
Euripides, Theseus in the *Hippolytus*, Oedipus in the *Phoenissae*,
though appearing late, are prepared for in the earlier action, and
their late appearance is justified by special conditions. In the
last case, for example, we have known of Oedipus from the start,
and his late appearance culminates the tragic fortunes of his house-
hold. In the *Hercules Furens*, on the other hand, the deferred
activity of Theseus, only slightly anticipated in verses 618–21,
makes him approximately a *homo ex machina*, in line with the divine
agents who solve the complications in some cases.

In respect to the messenger comedy is very different from tra-
gedy.[1] Greek tragedy employs as messengers slaves, heralds, guards,
who are in most cases active in other parts of the play and relatively
organic. But it indulges also in frankly inorganic messengers who
serve no other purpose than to announce the fatal catastrophe.
In comedy the occasions for a messenger are much more varied.
There is much more off-stage action to be reported. Nor is it
of the gruesome sort that prevails naturally at the tragic catas-
trophe. For this function comedy uses consistently organic rôles
who are elsewhere active in other functions. Acanthio, protatic rôle
in the *Mercator* and also a messenger, is a rare exception. Ergasilus,
loosely attached to the entire action of the *Captivi*, does convey
the critical news that solves the complications. But the only
close connection with tragedy is furnished in the one play that is
in origin itself a tragedy, the mythological travesty of the *Amphi-
truo*, in which the servant Bromia, hitherto inactive, reports the
birth of Hercules and the attendant circumstances in the style of
a tragic messenger. And in the same play, although he is an
organic rôle, Jupiter cuts the knot by his divine pronouncement
at the end, much as the mechanical *deus* does in extant Greek
tragedies.

[1] On the messenger in tragedy cf. Fischl, *Diss. Vindob.*, X (1910), 3 ff., and in
comedy Wagner, *De nuntiis comicis*, Breslau, 1913.

Though it regularly eschews the inorganic messenger, comedy in a small number of striking cases betrays by its structure a playwright's difficulties as he approaches the end of his work. Temporary and relatively mechanical rôles appear in the final chapter of the action of comedy usually for one of two reasons. Either the dramatist has become so absorbed in elaborating an ingenious web of intrigue that he has neglected to provide conditions which will lead to any natural overturn of the arch-intriguer's hitherto successful devices, or he has neglected to arrange for any natural development either of action or of corroborative testimony leading to the recognition of a lost child. Thus cornered, the poet occasionally introduces a more or less mechanical rôle to turn somewhat arbitrarily the balance against the intriguer and solve the complications resulting from his trick, or else to extricate the organic characters, by rapid recognition of a lost child, from whatever complications have developed.

So, if the present text of the *Asinaria* rightly ascribes the rôles,[1] the young man, Diabolus, after very slight and tardy preparation in verse 634, appears for the first time at verse 746 as a relatively mechanical device to bring about the peripety, with the assistance of an equally temporary and loosely attached parasite. The technique of the *Mostellaria*, though more skilful, is not impeccable. We have already seen that *pueri* are brought on late in the play to give the desired turn to events and upset the plans of the arch-intriguer. But the dramatist has not thereby met all his problems at the end of the play. He still has to solve the complications. And he has become so interested in planning the clever intrigues of Tranio that there is no natural means at hand for the solution. In the elaborate exposition of the piece the atmosphere of riotous conviviality was neatly suggested in a revel scene at the end of the first act. In this act there appeared a young companion of the hero, Callidamates, whose activity extended over into the next scene, in which he added considerably to the humor of the situation as an incidental rôle. After this broad exposition all the active characters of

[1] Havet, *Rev. de Phil.*, XXIX (1905), 94 ff., believes that Diabolus should be substituted for Argyrippus in the second and third scenes of the first act. Ahrens, *De Plauti Asinaria*, Jena, 1907, pp. 13 ff., argues against the view.

the first act were locked up in the house, except the intriguing slave, and thereby eliminated from the main intrigue, which occupies the second and third acts. Callidamates, therefore, along with the young lover, Philolaches, has not appeared on the stage for two acts, and Tranio, the intriguer, has dominated the action. When the time comes for solution, the dramatist has to choose between Philolaches and Callidamates as his agent in the settling of difficulties. He chooses Callidamates, who is then made to appear mechanically at verse 1122, lamely apologize for the arch-intriguer and the young rioters, and obtain the pardon of all involved in the scrape. Thus Callidamates, but for his incidental rôle in the revel scene and the initial action, is a *homo ex machina*.

But it is the recognition theme that most often prompts the use of mechanical and temporary rôles at the end of the play. To the temporary appearance of Stalagmus in the last act of the *Captivi* no objection, of course, can be raised; for though he appears only here, and merely to solve the complications, we have known of his existence from the start, and the dramatist has led us to expect him. The *Truculentus* is so loosely put together that it is hardly a fair example of normal procedure. But the rôle of Callicles, the old man, in the last act is certainly a surprise to the modern reader. The identity of the baby whom the courtezan, Phronesium, has obtained for the purposes of her trick against the soldier does not interest us in the least; but the dramatist seems to feel obliged to straighten out the future of another of her lovers, Diniarchus. Consequently, Callicles is lugged on in the last act, and through his efforts it is discovered that the baby is his illegitimate granddaughter and that Diniarchus is its father. Diniarchus is forced to marry the mother of the child. The casual appearance of a nurse to help establish the identity of a lost child is so short that we are not disturbed particularly by the rôle of Sophrona in the *Eunuchus* 910 ff. or of the *nutrix* in the *Heautontimorumenos* 614 ff.

The most obvious case of a catastrophic rôle in recognition plays is furnished by the *Andria*. In this play it is clear from allusions early in the drama that the heroine is familiar with part of her earlier history and that she has confided the facts to her

lover. These facts in themselves, however, are not sufficient to
establish her in the position of a free citizen, such as the situation
demands, unless they are corroborated by a quite unprejudiced
witness. And the conditions of the action as developed in the
earlier part of the play do not provide any such witness among
the active and organic characters. The witness must come from
Andros, the scene of the girl's early life. Consequently, when
the time comes for the solution of the difficulties the dramatist
lugs on the stage an old man, Crito, from Andros, justifying his
appearance rather neatly in verses 796 ff. But there has been no
preparation for Crito's appearance. For Donatus is certainly
forcing the interpretation when, on verse 71, he comments on *cog-
natorum neglegentia: hic iam parat nos ad Critonis adventum*. No
spectator or reader would recall at verses 796 this casual phrase
of verse 71. But on verse 796 Donatus has rightly understood and
described the technique of the poet: *in hoc loco persona ad catas-
tropham machinata nunc loquitur, nam hic Crito nihil argumento
debet nisi absolutionem erroris eius.*

The frank recognition of the catastrophic rôle as a mechanical
device makes us more charitably disposed toward two characters
who have been used to prop theories of contamination. In the
Rudens, as I have already pointed out in *Classical Philology*, XI,
126 ff., the obviously mechanical rôle of Gripus may not safely
be used to support a view that the play is contaminated. In this
play an outside person, apart from the victims of the shipwreck,
must accomplish the recovery of the chest which contains the tokens
that establish the identity of the heroine. And as the earlier action
does not provide any such person, Gripus, the fisherman, is inevi-
tably invented at verse 906, in this case, too, without any previous
introduction of him in the earlier stages of the plot, to achieve the
discovery and to bring about the solution of the complications.
To this argument, obtained from the inner necessity of the plot,
I may now add the obvious likeness between Crito's function in
the *Andria* and Gripus' in the *Rudens*.[1] The chief difference between

---

[1] The remarks of Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*², pp. 160–61, comparing the structure of the
Rudens with that of the *Hecuba* (cf. above ᵱ. 259), are very suggestive, but the con-
clusion "es kann nicht anders sein als dass Diphilus sich mit Bewusstsein an die
euripideische Erfindung angelehnt hat" indicates how far the chief exponent of

the two is that in Gripus' case the dramatist has developed a somewhat elaborate and diffuse chapter of action. The awkwardness is increased, too, in Gripus' case in so far as he, a slave in Daemones' household, seems to duplicate a natural function of the slave, Sceparnio, active in earlier scenes of the play. But obviously Sceparnio could not discover the chest if he were to be active on land as he is in the earlier scenes, and his dismissal from the action at the end of the second act is no more remarkable than the withdrawal of Palinurus in the *Curculio* or of Strobilus in the *Aulularia*, if Strobilus is not identical with the *servos Lyconidis* who is active in later scenes of the play. Inasmuch as the *Andria* is a contaminated play, it should perhaps be added that nobody contends that Crito's rôle in that play is affected at all by the combination of the two plays of Menander.

To these cases of catastrophic rôles I might easily add the rôle of Syncerastus in the *Poenulus*, who suddenly appears at verse 823 to provide the needed information about the free status of the two girls at an opportune moment late in the play. He emerges without introduction earlier in the action, and as quickly disappears. But in this case the text of the scene suggests that at some time in the tradition the scene itself may have stood earlier in the play, and the other evidence of contamination is so involved in the question that it is hardly safe to say more than that Syncerastus as a temporary and mechanical rôle, introduced late in the action to promote recognition, is Greek technique.[1]

In all these cases the catastrophic rôle, or the *homo ex machina*, has a perfectly definite function. There are two cases of temporary rôles that seem to have no very vital connection with the development of action. The text of the *Cistellaria* is fragmentary, but there is no clear indication that the old man, Demipho, appeared

the Euripidean theory is prepared to go in rapid inferences from the evidence. I should myself simply observe that both Euripides and Diphilus, in attempting to join somewhat alien chapters of action, hit upon the same and somewhat obvious device. Certainly the fact that Gripus finds "den ans Land gespülten Koffer" and the servant in the *Hecuba* finds "die ans Land gespülte Leiche" is hardly worthy of serious attention, especially when the equation in "ans Land gespülte" is based on such an equivocal phrase as *Rud.* 1019, *at ego inspectavi e litore.*

[1] On contamination in the *Poenulus* cf. Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], pp. 170 ff., and for earlier discussions the bibliography on p. 170, n. 2.

in the earlier scenes of the play. If this is the case, his sudden
and brief appearance in the last scene at verse 774 is extraordinary.
His name is given in verse 599, and we are conscious throughout
the play of his existence, but his activity at the end is singularly
futile. Somewhat similar, though more reasonable, is the appear-
ance of the father of the young heroes of the play in *Eunuchus*
971 ff. In this case Donatus informs us that the same character
appeared in Menander's original under a different name. The
father's appearance may be justified in so far as the betrothal of
Chaerea requires his consent, and the arrangements with Thais
(vss. 1039–40) apparently require his approval, but the introduction
of the old man is very abrupt.

VI

This survey of inorganic rôles in Roman comedy indicates that
characters are loosely and mechanically attached to the action for
various purposes. They assist in the exposition of situation and
action, in the portrayal of character, in the quick reversal of action,
and in the solution of complications. They provide entertain-
ment, especially in the case of buffoon rôles, such as parasites, cooks,
and *pueri delicati*. They fill intervals of time, either that off-
stage action may be satisfactorily covered or that a change of rôles
may be facilitated. Less clearly and frequently do they promote
dialogue, fill the stage, increase the volume of song, and enrich
the details of action. Seldom do they serve exclusively any one
of these various purposes. Inorganic rôles may expound action
or portray character exclusively. But stationary scenes in which
comic relief is furnished usually also subserve the economic con-
venience of time-filling. And in most of the instances the general
features of technique illustrated by the employment of inorganic
rôles are Greek rather than Roman. For the features are too per-
vasive to be anything but Greek in origin; the problems of dra-
matic composition which they solve confronted the composers of the
Greek originals; they are not problems that any special condi-
tions of the Roman stage and theater or of the Roman playwright's
dramatic art occasioned. At the same time any special case of the
general feature may, owing to other evidence outside the inorganic

rôle, or to special environing conditions of the scene in which he appears, properly lead to a suspicion of Roman intervention. But it should be admitted that Greek dramatic art is not impeccable, and that in any dramatic production loose organization which may disturb the thoughtful reader rarely troubles an audience absorbed in the more essential features of rapid action on the stage.

In comparison with tragedy comedy reveals a number of features which it shares with the more dignified type of drama. Like tragedy it employs protatic rôles. Sometimes it uses human agents mechanically to solve the complications, as tragedy uses divine agents. It avails itself of inorganic rôles to fill gaps in time and to facilitate change of rôles, just as tragedy often uses its organic chorus to provide stop-gaps in the action. Unlike tragedy it revels in comic episodes and episodic characters for comic effects. And it betrays an interest in character treatment that may be manifested by the use of loosely attached rôles to enhance clearness of portrayal; in this respect tragedy seldom, if ever, resorts to such means. Neither these points of likeness nor these differentiating features have any great significance. When the two types of drama agree, they are solving, similarly and independently, common dramatic problems by obvious and commonplace devices. When they disagree, comedy is satisfying special needs either of the dramatic type or of the later age from which it issues.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ARRIAN'S *ANABASIS* AND BOOK XVII OF DIODORUS

By R. B. Steele

Fränkel in *Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker* (pp. 460 ff.) concludes that Diodorus reproduces the work of Clitarchus with some modifications, and that he, as well as Aristobulus, the chief source of Arrian, made use of Callisthenes, Onesicritus, Chares, and Nearchus. The selection by Arrian of Aristobulus and Ptolemy is of itself an indication that their historical method differed from that of Clitarchus. He criticizes or omits many of the highly colored incidents found in Diodorus and has unnumbered details not recorded by the latter. That they are widely different in statements of facts is admitted, and the object of this investigation is to determine whether they have retained a similar form of statement. The data will be presented under two heads: I, personal—historical, ethical, rhetorical; and II, individual words and syntax.

I. PERSONAL

Arrian, *Anabasis* (vii. 22. 5),[1] in an original discussion names Seleucus as the greatest of the followers of Alexander. In contrast with this Diodorus (xvii. 103. 6) and Curtius (ix. 8. 22–24), by implication, assign this position to Ptolemy. Diodorus refers to other writers only a few times, but Arrian, in addition to his main sources, frequently mentions others and also reports items from the logos. He speaks of heroes only incidentally (iv. 8. 3; iv. 11. 3), while Diodorus in his opening paragraph, section 4, declares that Alexander was equal to any of the ancients, and by an adjective or adverb presents the heroic deeds of Admetus (45. 6), of Erigyius (83. 6), and of Porus (88. 6; see 95. 2; 102. 4).

The ethical environment set forth by the two writers is not the same. Diodorus (118. 1) mentions εὐσεβές as a spring of action; τὸ θεῖον (116. 1) and τὸ δαιμόνιον (116. 5). Arrian freely uses the last two expressions and has τυχόν a dozen times (see Boehner, *De Arriani dicendi genere*,[2] p. 39), with a few incidental references to

[1] In succeeding references, with Arrian *sc. Anabasis*, and with Diodorus xvii.

[2] *Acta Seminarii Phil. Erlangensis*, IV, 1 ff.

τύχη, whose importance in the eyes of Diodorus is shown by more than a score of occurrences. Various forms of τυγχάνω are found, the compound in ἐν- most freely in Arrian. In contrast with this are such expressions as συνέβη γενέσθαι (Diodorus 63. 4; 66. 2; 100. 1, and 103. 7). Compare Arrian i. 1. 9; i. 27. 7; ii. 10. 3; iv. 2. 5; v. 23. 5, usually συνέβη ὅπως εἴκασε. Necessity is stated alike in both, though Diodorus has ἀναγκαῖον applied to objective facts (43. 9; 55. 1; 94. 1) as well as to his own impelling motive (1. 4; 5. 3; 117. 5).

Some expressions of mental conditions and activities are peculiar to Arrian. Nominal and verbal forms of νοῦς are freely used,[1] and the impulse of Alexander is given with several verbs (i. 3. 5; ii. 3. 1; iii. 1. 5; vii. 2. 2; vii. 16. 2). Diodorus is strongly inclined to magnify, as is shown by ὑπερβολή in more than a dozen passages (see 11. 5; 20. 5; 101. 1; 103. 7). Arrian has the plural (iv. 11. 4), the noun, of physical passage (iii. 30. 6), and the verb in similar connections, while in Diodorus it is freely used in metaphorical statements. A number of other formations in ὑπερ- are not in Arrian, though we find ὑπερφέρω (not in Diodorus) (v. 4. 2; vi. 22. 7; vii. 6. 3). The use of γέμω is similar (Diodorus 94. 4; 104. 6); with physical objects (70. 2; 71. 1; 81. 1); and γεμίσαντας (105. 7).

Diodorus abounds in characterizations, and ἀνδρεία and ἀνδραγαθία occur scores of times, while there are corresponding verbal forms (89. 3; 99. 2; 100. 2; Arrian vii. 5. 4). The adjective and verbal forms used in such connections differ widely. Diodorus has διαφέρων (29) most freely, and διάφορος (20. 2; 32. 1; 75. 7). Besides these he uses a number of other prepositional compounds, as προέχων, also in Arrian (v. 17. 4). Words expressing admiration, as well as μεγαλοπρεπῶς and παραδόξως, with their corresponding adjective forms, are characteristic of Diodorus. He prefers the verb, generally the participle σπεύδων, to express the intense activity of Alexander, though occasionally he has κατὰ σπουδήν, which is in Arrian once (iii. 29. 6), but σπουδῇ scores of times. Diodorus also emphasizes ἐνέργεια, and in contrast with this has ἡσυχία in about a dozen places; in Arrian only (i. 14. 5; ii. 8. 5). The forms of incidental references

[1] ii. 26. 4; vii. 1. 5; vii. 18. 4; Praef. 3; iii. 18. 12; vi. 10. 3; ii. 4. 5; v. 23. 6; vii. 17. 2, et al.

differ. We find οὐκ ἀνοίκειον (Diodorus 71. 3), but ἄξιον more frequently, and with a negative (27.7; 46. 6); and with μνήμης (38. 5; 99. 1; 100. 1). The latter is in Arrian (ii. 24. 6), but also λόγου (v. 7. 3; vi. 9. 5; vii. 7. 7).

Some rhetorical differences are noticeable. There are a few examples of chiasmus in Arrian (e.g., i. 12. 9; ii. 7. 9), but, in contrast with this, the etymological figure occurs frequently (vii. 17. 1; vii. 23. 8); θυσίας . . . . θύεσθαι (vii. 14. 1; vii. 17. 4). Boehner (p. 34) calls attention to the frequent repetition of the noun by Arrian, thus avoiding the use of a pronoun. However, this usage with the verb is just as noticeable, Ἀρρύβας γὰρ νόσῳ ἀπέθανεν. ἀπέθανεν δὲ καὶ Ἀντίοχος (see i. 16. 6; i. 25. 8; ii. 4. 8; ii. 11. 5, 9; ii. 25. 2; ii. 27. 6; iii. 5. 4; iii. 5. 5).

II. INDIVIDUAL WORDS AND SYNTAX

A. INDIVIDUAL WORDS

1. *Time.*—The ways of fixing the center of reference for the actions of Alexander and his associates are very different. The fourscore occurrences of ἐν τούτῳ in Arrian are not relatively as frequent as those of μετὰ ταῦτα in Diodorus. One gives the actors in the midst of their activities; the other is retrospective. The plan of Arrian required a very free use of τότε, for which he often substitutes ἐν τῷ τότε and εἰς τότε (vi. 28. 4). He has more than forty instances of πάλαι, while both use τὸ παλαιόν, as also ἔτι and ἤδη, though there are comparatively few occurrences of the last two in Diodorus. Παραυτίκα seems limited to Arrian, as also αὖ, and αὖθις of which eighty occurrences were noticed. Ἐφεξῆς occurs (iv. 12. 2, 3; iv. 18. 7; vi. 11. 2) and ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐφεξῆς (vii. 11. 8), while ἑξῆς is preferred by Diodorus, and except for one instance (Arrian v. 17. 4) he only has πάλιν, Arrian usually having ἔμπαλιν alone, but with ἐς (iii. 12. 1) and with εἰς (ii. 11. 6). The general usage with ἅμα is not the same, though both use it singly and repeated as an adverb. With participles it is limited in Diodorus to seven examples of πραττομένοις. But the chief difference is in the prepositional usage in Diodorus, ἅμα δὲ τούτῳ (33. 6); ἅμα τούτοις (1. 2). Arrian associates it not only with these pronouns but with others of which οἱ is the most noticeable. It occurs also with

common nouns and still more freely with proper names. Diodorus has ὁμοῦ with contrasted terms (13. 3), and Arrian has φιλίοις τε ὁμοῦ καὶ πολεμίοις (iii. 11. 3; v. 17. 6) and it is repeated (iii. 22. 2; iv. 4. 7). Peculiar to Arrian is its association with ἤδη in nine passages, and in the same number it does not differ from ἅμα in emphasizing the temporal phases of accompaniment (e.g., i. 8. 3; ii. 3. 5; ii. 27. 6).

Arrian, giving the record by men who marched with Alexander, freely refers to the morrow, using ὑστεραίᾳ twenty-nine times, and with ἐς ten. We find νυκτός and νύκτωρ in both works. Compare with these ἐν νυκτί (v. 24. 1 [twice]; vi. 21. 4; vi. 26. 4), and ἅμα ἐν νυκτί (iii. 10. 2).

The far greater number of passages in Arrian fixing the time indicates that the ultimate source must have been a direct observer of the events recorded.

2. *Place.*—Some phases of local expression are as marked as are the temporal. Arrian usually has αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτόθι but uses the latter (iii. 2. 4; v. 5. 1; Diodorus 69. 6). The examples of οὗ are limited to ten in Arrian, with scores of occurrences of εἴσω and ἔξω, ἵνα and ἵναπερ, πόρρω and πρόσω. He alone has ἐνθένδε and ἐνθένπερ and ὅπου ten times. He is freest in the use of ἔνθα and ἔνθεν, ἐνταῦθα and ἐντεῦθεν, and has ἐκεῖ sixteen times (Diodorus 117. 1, κἀκεῖ), and ἐκεῖσε (i. 29. 3; iv. 11. 8; v. 3. 2; Diodorus 33. 6, κἀκεῖσε).

The particles in -θεν are one of the noticeable features in Arrian. A few are used as freely by Diodorus, e.g., πανταχόθεν seven times, and Arrian eight. In contrast with this, the latter has πάντοθεν fifteen times, and ἐκεῖθεν sixteen (Diodorus 108. 8). Still more noticeable are fifty-four occurrences of πρόσθεν, ἐπίπροσθεν (iii. 9. 2), and ἔμπροσθεν, five times (Diodorus 18. 2, τοὔμπροσθεν). Because of its form we also give δῆθεν (iv. 18. 4; vi. 13. 2; vii. 8. 2; vii. 14. 5; vii. 23. 2).

3. *Manner.*—Χαλεπῶς and ῥᾳδίως may be taken to indicate in fair degree the difference in verbal coloring. Diodorus uses both without a negative, while Arrian favors the former with a negative, and for him things are not easily done, but not with difficulty. He has ῥᾳδίως only a few times but εὐμαρῶς and εὐπετῶς often. Here also may be mentioned his freedom with ᾗ and ᾗπερ, as also with

ὅπῃ (15) and πολλαχῇ (11), while πάντῃ and ταύτῃ are among the
words he uses most freely. Diodorus has καθόλου nine times, and
λαμπρός, ὅμοιος, παντελής, πολυτελής, and ταχύ more freely than
Arrian.

4. *Nouns.*—We shall present only nouns in -βολή, -δρομή, and
-χώριοι. Ἐκβολή is found a score of times in Arrian (Diodorus 75. 2;
104. 3). The relative frequency for ἐμβολή, προσβολή, and συμβολή
is about the same, but προβολή seems limited to Arrian. On the other
hand Diodorus has only six other compounds, not counting ὑπερβολή,
occurring twenty-four times. Peculiar to him also is περίβολος
(50. 3; 52. 3; 71. 5; 85. 3). Ἐκδρομή occurs most freely of the
nouns in -δρομή, fourteen times in Arrian. Other forms are ἐπιδρομή
(Arrian i. 20. 5; vii. 21. 2), καταδρομή (iv. 1. 3; iv. 16. 6), συνδρομή
(vi. 3. 4; Diodorus 19. 1; 63. 1; 101. 4). Arrian has ἐγχώριοι and
ἐπιχώριοι, but προσχώριοι more often than these two combined.
Diodorus uses πλησιοχώριοι freely as a noun and as an adjective
(64. 2; 87. 1; 113. 2).

5. *Pronouns.*—Such combinations as ἄλλον ἐξ ἄλλου occur by the
score in the *Anabasis*, but in Diodorus they are limited to 37. 1,
though he favors ἀλλήλων and ἀμφότερος. With οἷ, σφῶν, and σφέτερος
the usage of the two is entirely distinct. Arrian has οἷ in more than
a score of passages, the larger part similar to ἅμα οἷ ἄγων (i. 15. 3).
The plural forms are noticeable (see Boehner, p. 31). These are
sometimes reinforced as σφῶν τε αὐτῶν (iv. 13. 7); σφᾶς αὐτούς
(iv. 17. 6; Diodorus 22. 4). All the examples of ὅτι περ and the
nine of σφέτερος are in Arrian, who also uses ὅπερ much oftener than
Diodorus. Notice Arrian ὁσωνπερ (iv. 21. 9) and similar forms
(vi. 14. 4; vi. 29. 10; vii. 1. 6). Here also may be mentioned his
thirteen examples of ἐς τοσόνδε. He has τοὺς μέν . . . . τοὺς δέ a
few times, for which in corresponding passages Diodorus uses οὓς
μέν . . . . οὓς δέ.

6. *Adjectives.*—The different forms of πᾶς are not evenly dis-
tributed between the two works, the most marked contrast being in
the use of σύμπας, which is found at least seventy-nine times in
Arrian; in Diodorus once (17. 4). However, the latter favors
ἅπας, 48 to 15, and has πᾶς relatively more freely, 148 to 190. An-
other favorite of his is ἴδιος, fifty-two times, seven neuter and most of

them with συνέβη. The plural is found eight times; also κατ' ἰδίαν
(112. 3). Arrian uses the latter without a preposition (i. 26. 4);
ἰδίᾳ, eight times, and ἐς τὰ ἴδια (v. 25. 1). In contrast with Diodorus
he has ἐπέκεινα a score of times, while κάρτερος, κουφότατος, and ὅσος
are favorites, the latter being especially noticeable with numerals.
Diodorus is inclined to the use of ὅλος, πλησίος, and πολλαπλάσιος,
and has most of the instances of παντοδαπός, παραθαλάττιος, and
περιβόητος. Παμπληθεῖς is in 35. 2; 61. 3; 110. 6; πλήρης in 26. 6;
32. 1; 110. 5; and πληρόω occurs more freely than in Arrian.

7. *Numerals.*—Both writers have prepositions with numerals,
and ἐς in such connections is one of the marked features of the
style of Arrian, εἰς taking its place in a few passages. Περί occurs
less freely, and ὑπέρ in a dozen passages (Diodorus 14. 1; 21. 6;
89. 2; 102. 6). The most noticeable use of μάλιστα in Arrian is with
numerals, but this association was not noticed in Diodorus. How-
ever, he has about a dozen examples of σχεδόν, generally with ἅπας,
but with numerals (69. 3; 110. 3; cf. 94. 1, σχεδὸν ὀκταετῆ χρόνον;
and Arrian iii. 15. 6, σχεδόν τι οἱ ἡμίσεες). Forms of λείπων indicate
less than the given number in Diodorus 65. 1 and 109. 2, and in
eight other passages show a falling short in some quality. The
same use is made of ἐλάττων in half a dozen places with numerals,
and in another connection (38. 1). Arrian uses the word with a
negative (ii. 5. 7; v. 20. 4). For πλείους see Arrian i. 3. 5; i. 11. 3;
iii. 30. 11; πλείονας, iv. 6. 2; vii. 13. 1—all with a negative; in
contrast with ἐλάττους see Diodorus 9. 3; 21. 6; 31. 2; 36. 6.
Arrian also has οὐ πλείων ἤ (ii. 11. 10; iii. 7. 7), and ἀποδέων with
numerals (i. 14. 4; v. 4. 4; v. 24. 5), and with οὐ πολύ (v. 14. 1;
vi. 2. 4).

8. *Particles.*—One of the clearly marked contrasts is in the usage
with τε καί. The average is only about one occurrence for every
two pages in Diodorus, either together or separated. In Arrian
the two are everywhere in evidence, and two examples in one short
statement are not unusual (i. 9. 10; i. 21. 1; vii. 15. 4). There
may be three (vi. 27. 4; vii. 1. 2), four (i. 24. 1, 2), or even five (i.
22. 2; see also v. 12. 2; vi. 2. 3; vii. 12. 3). Noticeable in Diodorus
are διό (29), διόπερ (25), and διότι (8); in Arrian iv. 9. 7. The
former begins many a statement with τὸ πρῶτον, generally inclosing

μὲν or μὲν οὖν, while Arrian prefers the plural (e.g., i. 20. 8; ii. 10. 1; iii. 6. 5). But in indicating the limit Diodorus uses τέλος more freely and has the variation τὸ τελευταῖον (111. 3; 115. 6). The *Anabasis* has ὡσαύτως a score of times and οὕτως or οὕτω frequently, and these are not uncommonly associated with δή, which occurs nearly four hundred times and about one in five with μέν. Arrian favors οὔκουν and has μὲν οὖν a few times. This combination is used oftener than οὖν by Diodorus, and the sum for him far outnumbers the sum for Arrian. Boehner (p. 30) gives the occurrences of καίτοι with participles, though it generally appears in other connections. This word seems limited to Arrian, and also μέντοι (10), excepting Diodorus (8. 6). Ἄρα is found in more than a score of passages, and ἅτε in ten, usually with a participle, and in ii. 18. 5 and vii. 7. 7 with δή (see Boehner, pp. 51–52, and for οἷα as an equivalent see p. 51). In contrast with this we find ἅτε in Diodorus 88. 4 only; but ὥσπερ (38. 6; 117. 2), ὡσπερεὶ τετρωμένος (112. 5). There is a freer usage in Arrian, and thirty-six instances of καθάπερ to two in Diodorus (54. 2; 112.6). Notice also μᾶλλόν τι and μεῖον, e.g., ἀλλ᾽ Ἀλέξανδρος ἤλαυνεν οὐδὲν μεῖον (iii. 28. 9). But see in the same sentence ᾔει δὲ ὅμως. In Arrian ὡς is found in several connections. There are scores of examples of ὡς ἐπί, and occasionally with some other preposition, as ὡς ἐς μάχην; ὡς εἰς πόλεμον (Diodorus 86. 5). It is freely used in parenthetic statements, but ὡς ἔχειν is characteristic of Arrian: i. 13. 6; ii. 11. 4; iv. 2. 6; v. 13. 1; v. 23. 3; and vi. 6. 6, ὡς τάχους ποδῶν εἶχον. There is the least difference with participles, but Diodorus has more examples with ἄν (e.g., 33. 4; 33. 7; 77. 6; and 96. 2). This is unusual for Arrian, Ἀλέξανδρος ὡς καὶ ταῦτα ἂν πράξας καὶ εἰπών (ii. 12. 8).

    9. *Prepositions.*—In no respect are the personal preferences of the writers more clearly expressed than with prepositions, both improper and proper. Arrian has ὡς as a preposition, ἦκεν ὡς Ἀλέξανδρον (i. 4. 6; i. 25. 9; iv. 22. 6; v. 20. 7). Diodorus on the other hand uses χωρίς a dozen times. There is some difference in the usage with nearly all the others. This is least marked perhaps with πρό and παρά. Arrian has the former in one noticeable phrase, πρὸ πολλοῦ πεφεύγεσαν (vi. 6. 6); and Diodorus emphasizes the dative, especially ἀμφοτέροις, with παρά. Arrian only uses ἀμφί, and

80 per cent of all the occurrences in personal connections, the larger
part of the remainder in temporal expressions or with numerals.
Place is indicated, ἀμφὶ τὸ ἱερόν (i. 23. 5; iii. 16. 5; vii. 20. 3).   He
has σύν at least 208 times (Diodorus seven), oftenest with στρατιᾷ
and δυνάμει.   The latter word occurs most freely thirty times, in
Diodorus with μετά (Arrian i. 5. 8).   This is his favorite preposition
and is most noticeable with ταῦτα, μάχην, and with ὀλίγον (31. 4;
101. 4;   103. 2;   5;   116. 4).

a) Frequency: Arrian has ἕνεκα, εἵνεκα (perhaps οὕνεκα, i. 12.
10; iv. 15. 2) in about two score of passages (see Boehner, p. 44);
in Diodorus 24. 1; 77. 2; 110. 5; and 15. 2, ἕνεκα τοῦ μηδὲν ἀνήκεστον
παθεῖν.   Πλήν as a preposition and πλήν γε δή are found chiefly in
the Anabasis.   Diodorus uses εἰς, though ἐς is prevalent in the
Anabasis.   According to Herscher (Minora Scripta, ad p. vi. [Indica
3. 8]), "Undevicies in hoc libello diphthongus legitur, vocalis simplex
ducentis viginti amplius."   The most noticeable feature is its use
with numerals, and after this with adjectives and adverbs, especially
those of time.   The use of διά with μακροῦ and ὀλίγου is similar,
though the preposition is used relatively five times as freely by
Diodorus.   He also stresses ὑπό with the genitive and the accusative,
the dative occurring 66. 7, ὑπὸ τῷ θρόνῳ.   The most pronounced
feature in Arrian is ὑπὸ τὴν ἕω at least thirteen times.   Time is
stated, ὑπὸ τῇ πρώτῃ ἐμβολῇ (ii. 22. 2);   and there are at least nine-
teen other instances of the dative.

b) Associations: Both works have ἄνευ and μέχρι, for the most
part, in entirely different associations.   The Anabasis has ἀνά in a
few places with local connections, and ἀνὰ κράτος (iv. 17. 1), while
Diodorus has ἀνὰ μέσον seven times.   Arrian shows the greater
freedom with ἀντί (34 to 4) because it is used to give the details of
changes in petty rulers, matters which are not usually mentioned by
Diodorus, who has ἀπό to designate temporal relations (71. 1), ἀπὸ
Κύρου, other examples taking the form ἀπὸ τούτων γενόμενος (73. 1;
81. 1;   95. 3;   106. 2).   Time is expressed by ἐκ with a few nouns
(Arrian vii. 14. 4, ἐκ παιδός);   but generally with a pronoun, and
πολλοῦ, a dozen times (Diodorus 99. 5), and ἐκ παλαιοῦ, seven.   With
other adjectives and adverbs the usage is fairly free (see Boehner,
p. 41).   The larger part of the examples of ἐν are with τούτῳ (81),

τῷ τότε (48), νυκτί (11), and ἡμέραις (14). The first three are confined to the *Anabasis*, while the last is as freely used by Diodorus. The latter inclines to ἐν μάχῃ (the plural in Arrian ii. 7. 7), the former to ἐν χερσί (Diodorus 56. 1). There are also occurrences with adverbs, and in this respect ἐν resembles ἐκ, but the associations are for the most part different.

In temporal expressions, Diodorus favors κατά, e.g., 101. 3, κατὰ τὸν ἐξῆς πότον; and, excepting in a few passages with numerals and 38. 2, ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡλικίαν, has ὑπέρ only with the genitive—about twenty examples. In the *Anabasis* are the same number with numerals, and a small number with local associations. For ὑπέρ = *de*, see Boehner (p. 46). The use of ἐπί with the accusative is about the same; but Arrian has it more freely with the genitive and much more so with the dative. Of most interest are ὡς ἐπί, ἐπὶ μέγα, and ἐπὶ πολύ. In Diodorus are more than a dozen examples with ἡμέρας, and with this compare Arrian iv. 13. 5. Other temporal phrases are few, e.g., ἔστε ἐπὶ βουλυτόν (ii. 3. 3). Among the nouns in the dative we find ἡμέρᾳ (Arrian ii. 26. 4; iii. 4. 2; iii. 21. 6) and τελευτῇ (i. 10. 5); while Diodorus has τούτοις (8. 2; 28. 2; 84. 1). The free use of ἀμφί in the *Anabasis* left little room for περί in personal connections, though with the accusative it gives both time and place, and also occurs with numerals. Most of the examples with the genitive in Diodorus express personal relations; in the *Anabasis* the nouns are mostly abstract, so that the proportion of the two classes differs widely. The dative seems limited to Arrian i. 22. 6; i. 27. 1; vi. 18. 2; vii. 24. 2, περὶ τῷ θρόνῳ. The relative frequency for πρός with all the cases is about the same, but there is not an even distribution. Diodorus avoids it with the genitive, but has it with the accusative more than twice as often as Arrian, and with the dative, usually τούτοις, only half as frequently. A few passages (as Diodorus 40. 1 and 113. 1) give temporal relations, and local (25. 5). This usage is quite marked in the *Anabasis:* iii. 8. 7 and iv. 20. 1, πρὸς Ἰσσῷ, for the usual ἐν Ἰσσῷ. Noticeable are nine examples of πρὸς ἔω (e.g., v. 3. 3; v. 5. 4; cf. 5. 6. 3).

If we take into the count both prepositions and compound verbs there is no difference between Arrian and Diodorus, as the former has 29. 33 per page (Roos's ed.) and the latter 29. 31 (Fisher's

ed.).   But the two elements are not equally distributed, the numbers for Arrian being 15. 24 and 14. 09, and for Diodorus 12. 69 and 16. 62.   One emphasizes the preposition, the other the compound verb. Prepositions with the infinitive occur most freely in Diodorus, and διά most often; in Arrian εἰς and ἐπί.

Diodorus seems the more inclined to the use of inlocked prepositional phrases.   This usage is not limited to a few prepositions for most of them occur in phrases expressing an attributive relation to some other phrase.   A single instance from each will be enough for illustration: ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Ἰσσῷ μάχης (Diodorus 39. 1); ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ θάτερα τῆς πόλεως ναυτικοῦ (Arrian ii. 21. 8).

A common rhetorical feature is the same preposition in successive phrases, e.g., διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν διὰ τούτων (Diodorus 53. 1).   See also with ἐπί (18. 4; 82. 1); with κατά (103. 7).   The Anabasis has παρά and πρός most freely (i. 19. 1; i. 25. 4, 9; ii. 2. 1; iii. 23. 8; iv. 1. 1; iv. 5. 1; v. 20. 6; i. 25. 4; ii. 17. 2; v. 26. 3).

Arrian and Diodorus vary greatly in their use of participles, the average for one being 15. 8 per page; for the other, 10. 7.   Examples of ἄρας are noticeable in the Anabasis, and of χρώμενος in Diodorus, who has the genitive absolute about four and one-half times as often as Arrian.   The usage with individual verbs also shows some clearly marked tendencies.   One feature peculiar to Diodorus is ὑπῆρχε instead of ἦν (e.g., 7. 2; 34. 5; 71. 7; 90. 1).   He is also more inclined to use εἶναι and its compounds with the infinitive (13. 6; 60. 4; 82. 8; 25. 4; 34. 1; 38. 6; Arrian v. 18. 5; vi. 27. 5).

There are clear indications of selection in the case of a few verbs. Βούλομαι, usually a participle, is the regular word for Diodorus, but ἐθέλω for Arrian, though he has some instances of the former (ii. 14. 4; v. 2. 3; v. 27. 1; v. 27. 7 [twice]; vi. 14. 3; vii. 10. 5), all in the presumed remarks of the actors.   For the Anabasis καλούμενος is regular (συνεπι-, vi. 3. 1).   Diodorus has ἐπι- in 20. 7, and ἐγ- in 113. 1, though he prefers ὀνομαζόμενος.   Both have finite forms of the two verbs (see Boehner, Arriana).[1]

There are clearly marked distinctions in the use of verbs of motion.   T. Hultzsch[2] calls attention to the fact that forms of

---

[1] Acta Seminarii Phil. Erlangensis, II. 501 ff.

[2] De Elocutione Diodori Siculi.   De Usu Aoristi et Imperfecti, Pars I (1893), p. 22.

ἰέναι are rarely found in Diodorus.   Arrian freely uses the aorist of
the compounds in ἀπο- and ἐπι-, and the imperfect of ἀνα-, ἐπι-, and
μετα-.   There are scores of instances of ἐλαύνω and of its compounds,
but the occurrences of these and of ἀφίκετο are few in Diodorus.
The compounds of χωρέω are not equally stressed.   That in προ- is
frequent in Arrian, while προs- occurs less frequently; in Diodorus
συν- is most freely used.   He has προσάγω oftener than προ-, while
Arrian prefers ἐπι-, though he has προs- occasionally.   A few verbs
seem limited to Diodorus, as ἤγγισε and συνήγγισε (41. 4; 49. 6),
διανύω and κατανύω (49. 6).   He has most of the occurrences of
ἀθροίζω and of ἀναζευγνύω; see in 31. 2, ἀναζεύξας.   Hultzsch (p. 84)
states that forms of this verb in -μι do not occur in Diodorus (see
Arrian i. 5. 1; and cf. i. 26. 5; ii. 5. 8; iii. 4. 5).   There are similar
differences in the use of βάλλω, δέχομαι, δίδωμι, λαμβάνω, πέμπω,
στέλλω, as well as of a number of others occurring less frequently.   A
detailed statement will be given for verbs of dying.   The regular one
for Diodorus is τελευτάω; for Arrian, ἀποθνήσκω.   Notice the occur-
rences in corresponding passages in Diodorus (21. 6; 36. 6) and Arrian
(1. 16. 6; ii. 11. 8).   Though the same words are used the forms
may differ, as in statements of burial τετελευτηκότας (Diodorus 89. 3);
τελευτήσαντας (Arrian v. 24. 6;   Diodorus 14. 1;   and 40, .1);   but
compare ἀποθανόντας (i. 23. 6).   The same difference can be seen
for ἔπεσον and ἀπέθανον in Diodorus (34. 5; 89. 1, 3) and in Arrian
(i. 16. 4; v. 18. 2, 3).   There is also a preference shown in the use
of two other kindred verbs, for ἑάλω is as noticeable in Arrian as is
ἀνεῖλε in Diodorus.

B. SYNTAX

1. *Accusative of extent.*—Diodorus has σταδίους (33. 1;   87. 3)
and ὁδόν (32. 2;   83. 2).   Arrian has the same usage a few times,
but with two distinct features, the indication of the extent by a prepo-
sitional phrase, e.g., ἐs πέντε μάλιστα σταδίους (i. 20. 2), ὅσον ἐs
τριάκοντα σ. (iii. 9. 3), and also without the preposition ὅσον ἐξακο-
σίους σ. (iii. 8. 7).

2. *Conditional statements.*—Both use these freely, but only
Arrian uses such parenthetic statements as σέ, εἴπερ τινὰ ἄλλον
(iv. 11. 6), while Diodorus only has ἐάν (2. 5; 39. 1; 69. 1; 72. 2;
103. 1; 112. 3).

3. *Causal statements.*—The cause is freely given in the *Anabasis* by a ὅτι- clause, e.g., διὰ βαθύτητά τε καὶ ὅτι ὀξὺς ὁ ῥοῦς ἦν (iv. 25. 7). The restrictive ὅτι μή occurs in more than a score of passages (i. 19. 8; i. 26. 1; ii. 7. 8).

4. *Consecutive and final clauses.*—The statistics[1] for ὡς, ἵνα, and ὅπως in Arrian, the ὡς- sentences including tendency as well as purpose, show that ὡς with the infinitive, much less freely with finite forms of the verb, is the predominant particle, and that, numerically considered, ἵνα and ὅπως are not important. Ἵνα is commonly used to express local relations, but as a final particle it occurs in only four passages (see Diodorus 4. 8; 77. 7). Arrian has ὅπως most freely with the indicative, as ὅπως εἶχον (i. 27. 7), and in the phrase συνέβη ὅπως εἴκασε. It occurs with ἄν (iv. 22. 6; vii. 15. 2). The ten final clauses are all affirmative, excepting in vi. 4. 3. Both affirmative and negative clauses occur oftener in Diodorus, the most noticeable example being ὅπως μὴ δύνωνται κυκλοῦν (57. 5), which corresponds to similar statements in Arrian with ὡς (i. 4. 4; ii. 8. 4). The negative is used alone in ii. 3. 7; vi. 13. 1; vii. 13. 3. Arrian usually has ὥστε with finite forms of the verb (see Boehner, p. 56), while it was noticed in Diodorus seven times with the infinitive, and with a negative 8. 4.

5. *Temporal statements.*—At the head of the list of temporal particles in the *Anabasis* is ὡς with scores and scores of examples, occasionally with a correlative. Only twenty-seven were noticed in Diodorus, e. g., ὡς δ' ἤγγισαν (11. 3). Ἐπάν is limited to Arrian (iii. 3. 4; vi. 5. 7), and though he has more examples of ἐπεί with causal force, Diodorus has the particle oftener. He uses ἐπειδή occasionally (Arrian 27), and ἐπειδάν (106. 3), which occurs fifteen times in the *Anabasis*. Neither uses ὅτε or ὅταν freely, Arrian having τοτε . . . . ὅτε (ii. 1. 4; iv. 15. 1). Compare with these ὁπότε . . . . τότε (vii. 18. 6). He also has twenty-five other examples of ὁπότε. There is a free use of ἔστε, twenty-three instances with finite forms of the verb, and of these iii. 20. 4 gives local relations. With the infinitive it occurs five times, as in iv. 7. 1. The meaning is "as long as" or "until," and with the latter meaning nine passages have ἄν, and two (ii. 23. 3; iv. 30. 3) do not.

[1] Dr. H. A. Short, *AJP*, VII, 167, n. 1.

There are fifty-two examples of ἔστε ἐπί with either temporal or local force (see Boehner, *Arriana*, p. 504). Neither τέως nor ἕως is freely used (the latter in ii. 8. 2; iv. 27. 2); without a verb, ἕως ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι τὸ βάθος (i. 6. 1). Diodorus has it in 62. 1 and 92. 3; and with ἄν in 7. 7; 26. 1; and 28. 2. Arrian has πρίν as a preposition, πρὶν φάους (iii. 18. 6), in thirty passages with an infinitive, and a few times with finite forms of the verb, πρὶν Δαρεῖόν τε πεφευγότα ἤσθοντο καὶ πρὶν ἀπορραγῆναι (ii. 11. 2; ii. 11. 7; vi. 13. 2; vii. 14. 3; vii. 22. 1); and with the subjunctive μὴ . . . . πρὶν . . . . κατίδωσιν (v. 16. 3).

The elements of expression in the works are widely different, and when these are wrought into connected narrative the results are not akin. There is a unity in the style of Arrian, and also, though a different one, in that of Diodorus, and the main features that we have considered are the same in the remaining parts of the works of both. Occasionally there is a similarity or equivalence of diction in the statement of some important point, while the context is entirely different. Arrian, Ταῦτα δὲ διαπραξάμενος ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν (i. 11. 1) equals Diodorus, Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς ἐπανελθών . . . . εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν . . . . (16. 1), but the latter goes on to tell of a council of the leaders and of contests, at Dios to Zeus and the Muses, which Archelaus had established. Arrian says that they were at Aegae, and brings in the reference to the Muses under λέγουσι. διαβαίνει τὸν πόρον (Arrian iii. 7. 5) is equivalent to τὸν πόρον . . . . μαθὼν διεβίβασε τὴν δύναμιν (Diodorus 55. 3), although the details in the entire chapter are not in harmony with those given by Arrian of the movements of Alexander from the Euphrates to the crossing of the Tigris.

Interpretations of the main fact may widely differ. Arrian (i. 20. 1) says that Alexander had in mind to dismiss the fleet because of lack of money, and because the Persian fleet was not strong. Diodorus says that the design was to cut off hope of retreat, as Alexander had done at the Granicus, and as Agathocles did. Memnon advised, according to Arrian i. 12. 9, not to run any risk (μὴ διὰ κινδύνου ἰέναι) but to harry the land. The opposition expressed by Arsites prevailed, because the Persians were suspicious of him. Diodorus (18. 2) has the equivalent (μὴ διακινδυνεύειν), but Memnon further

advises to carry the war into Europe, and these suggestions were rejected because unworthy of the magnanimity of the Persians.

As we have stated ἤδη is freely used by Arrian, and occurs in i. 20. 3, indicating the previous appointment of Memnon, and this fact is stated again (ii. 1. 1).   Diodorus (23. 6; 29. 1) speaks of it as an act contemporaneous with the other events mentioned.   Similar to this is Arrian (iii. 18. 10), where it is stated that Alexander found the Araxes already bridged, while Diodorus has Τὸν ᾿Αράξην ποτα-μὸν ζεύξας διεβίβασε τοὺς στρατιώτας (69. 2).

The data presented show two types of literary expression distinct in many particulars.   If derived from a common source, for successive stages of the history, they have been so transformed that the products are no longer similar.   At the same time, there are some points of resemblance, the result of the statement of events common to every history of Alexander.   These need no unity of source for their explanation while the diversity of expression is against rather than for such a theory.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

HECTOR'S CHARIOTEER

In *Classical Philology*, VI (1911), 37–47, Mr. A. Shewan discussed the arguments by which Wilamowitz tried to prove that Θ of the *Iliad* was composed late, and "as a bridge between H and Λ." Mr. Shewan confined himself to rebuttal. I wish to call attention to a bit of positive evidence that Θ is presupposed not only in M and N but also in Λ and Π.

At the climax of the *Patrocleia* the death of Patroclus follows immediately upon that of Cebriones, Hector's brother and charioteer, whom Patroclus has slain (Π 737 ff.). That the poet's audience is familiar with the name of Cebriones and the capacity in which he is acting is clear from Π 727 f.,

> Κεβριόνῃ δ' ἐκέλευσε δαΐφρονι φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
> ἵππους ἐς πόλεμον πεπληγέμεν.

At what point in the story is Cebriones introduced? Let us trace backward the few references to him. At N 790 he is on foot with Hector and Poulydamas in the center of the battle. Why he has left the chariot we learn from M 91 f.: Hector and Poulydamas, on the advice of the latter, leave the chariots behind, and lead one of the five divisions of Trojans against the Wall,

> καί σφιν Κεβριόνης τρίτος εἵπετο. πὰρ δ' ἄρ' ὄχεσφιν
> ἄλλον Κεβριόναο χερείονα κάλλιπεν Ἕκτωρ.

(This "weaker man" is in charge of Hector's chariot at Ξ 431.) Again at Λ 521 f. familiarity with the name of Hector's charioteer is taken for granted:

> Κεβριόνης δὲ Τρῶας ὀρινομένους ἐνόησεν
> Ἕκτορι παρβεβαώς (i.e., in his chariot, cf. vss. 503, 527 ff.).

The only other passage in which Cebriones is mentioned is Θ 318 f.: Hector has already lost two charioteers in succession, Eniopeus (Θ 119 ff.) and Archeptolemus (Θ 312 ff.):

> Κεβριόνην δ' ἐκέλευσεν ἀδελφεὸν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα
> ἵππων ἡνί' ἑλεῖν· ὁ δ' ἄρ' οὐκ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας.

The foregoing are all the references in the *Iliad* either to Cebriones or to a charioteer of Hector. In the first day's battle, with the exception of two passages (E 494, Z 103), in which he leaps to the ground from his chariot, Hector is represented as fighting on foot, and after the death of Patroclus he sends his chariot back to the city with his armor (P 130 f., 189 ff.). From this time until his death it is not mentioned (van Leeuwen on Π 734). But

from Θ to P it is kept continually before our eyes. And as B Γ show Hector to us as general, Z as son and husband, and H as single champion, so Θ introduces him as a "bold driver" (vss. 88 ff.), describes the care bestowed on his horses by Andromache (vss. 186 ff.), and names the warrior who on Hector's brief day of glory, the third day's battle, is to act as his charioteer. The fact that in Λ, M, N, and Π a knowledge of the name of Hector's charioteer is taken for granted, and that this knowledge was gained in Θ is worth adding to the rapidly increasing pile of evidence that the *Iliad* is of a single warp and woof, rather than a patchwork, and that Θ cannot be taken away without leaving some ragged ends in the later books.

The objection may be made that the originality of each of the passages which we have cited from Λ, M, N, and Π has been challenged by some modern scholar, although by none of the ancient critics. We do not think it necessary to answer this objection at present since about four-fifths of the *Iliad* has suffered in this way during the past century. We only note a remarkable case of oscitancy on the part of Düntzer in his argument for the rejection of Λ 521–43 (*Homerische Abhandlungen*, p. 69). Düntzer asks how it happens that we find Hector in his chariot at this point, whereas at vss. 295 ff. he was on foot, as he is again at M 40. Of course a careful reading of the poem would have given the answer: at Λ 359 f. the poet tells us that Hector mounted his chariot again,

$$ἂψ ἐς δίφρον ὀρούσας$$
$$ἐξέλασ' ἐς πλῆθυν,$$

and at M 81 we learn that he was not on foot but in his chariot at M 40. An equally careful and sympathetic reading of the *Iliad* will remove, we think, the other objections to the passages under discussion. Certainly if Θ were one of the latest expansions it is hard to conceive how a diaskeuast or the wretched centoist whom the critics assume to have been the composer of Θ, should have taken the pains to refer so consistently to a minor character like Cebriones four times before his death at Π 737 ff.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

ON POLYBIUS xxi. 5. 6

ἀγαθοὶ γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐκ τῶν κατὰ λόγον, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν συμβαινόντων ποιεῖσθαι τὰς διαλήψεις.

Ernesti in his *Lexicon Polybianum* interprets "'amant, solent judicare.' Nisi ita intelligendum non sunt habiles ad judicandum ex eo quod rationi est consentaneum, sed tantum ex eventu." The second suggestion is very harsh in view of the position of the οὐκ, and it will not be easy to find parallels for the first. Polybius is a slovenly writer, and may have extended ἀγαθός

with the infinitive to include undesirable qualities. But it is simpler to suppose that he wrote εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ πολλοί. Cf. Plato's *Laws* 916 D: εἰώθασιν οἱ πολλοί.

PAUL SHOREY

VENTIDIUS AND SABINUS

Some years ago I printed in *Classical Philology* (VIII, 389–400) an article in which I essayed to prove that a candidate for office jestingly alluded to in a certain letter of Cicero (*Fam.* xv. 20) could not possibly be the well-known Ventidius Bassus. Toward the end of the article I set down also a considerable number of reasons for believing that neither could the *Sabinus mulio* of the pseudo-Vergilian *Catalepton* x be Ventidius. Of this article I am reminded by certain remarks of Professor Tenney Frank recently published (*Class. Phil.*, XV, 117). He mentions me with Th. Birt as opposing the identification of *Sabinus mulio* with Ventidius (which Mr. Frank for the sake of his thesis is bound to uphold), and states just two of my points as "the chief objections recently offered against the identification." These two points only he proceeds to answer. The casual reader might well imagine that I had myself put them so prominently forward as practically to rest my case upon them. I did not, and do not, so distinguish them. The second of them, indeed, was distinctly set forth as directed, not against the identification as such, but against Bücheler's peculiar argument for it. The case rests on a dozen or twenty reasons, not on these two, which might, indeed, be entirely sacrificed without substantially impairing the validity of the main proposition.

But let us examine Mr. Frank's answers, which, as he affirms, make my objections disappear. He advances in defense of Bücheler a statement which Bücheler was certainly far from having in mind himself. Bücheler surely was thinking of the praetor as sitting on the regular tribunal praetorium, which he assumed was close by the temple of Castor. I pointed out that the praetor's tribunal is now known to have been far from Castor's temple. Mr. Frank answers on Bücheler's and his own behalf that in the late republic "the praetor's court was for some reason frequently held at the tribunal Aurelium, which was at the lower end of the forum and apparently near the front steps of the temple of Castor." This is all news indeed to me! I am not ignorant of the few ancient references to the tribunal Aurelium, but I had therefrom supposed the precise site of it (though it was doubtless in the Forum) to be indeterminable. That is the judgment of such men as Jordan and Hülsen. One might legitimately wonder on what Mr. Frank bases his assertion about its position. If I were to hazard a guess concerning the site, though I concede all the difficulties to be raised against the determination, I should be inclined to place it near the other end of the Forum, where the

rising ground gave convenient opportunity for the construction of the *gradus Aurelii*, whence the populace, as from the seats in a theater, viewed the operations at the tribunal. Steps and tribunal perhaps disappeared in the rebuilding at that end of the Forum in the last years of the republic and first of the empire, along with the construction of the great basilicas. At any rate they are not later referred to. It appears quite improbable to suppose, as Mr. Frank perhaps does, that the steps up to Castor's temple were the *gradus Aurelii*. I also am aware that certain judicial sessions were held (it does not appear how often) at the Aurelian tribunal. But these had appeared to me to be not of "the praetor's court," properly so denominated, but of certain *quaestiones*. Yet even if all that Mr. Frank so unhesitatingly affirms could be true, it would yet be unreasonable to imagine that a reference to the praetor sitting in court (if that were, as Mr. Frank believes it is, the meaning in *Catal*. x) would naturally suggest to a Roman the tribunal Aurelium rather than the tribunal praetorium.

The other of Mr. Frank's answers is that Vergil in speaking of Gallia in *Catal*. x might well have in mind the Picentine birthplace of Ventidius, since "the northern part of Picenum was frequently called Ager Gallicus"; and by capitalization of both words Mr. Frank makes of the ager Gallicus of Picenum a geographical proper name. That appears to be unjustifiable. The demagogue tribune Flaminius, probably in 232 B.C., had evicted the Gallic inhabitants from a piece of territory in the neighborhood of Ariminum and had settled Roman colonists on it. This tract was henceforth reckoned as a part no longer of Gallia but afterward of Picenum. The violent political conflict that resulted in its acquisition was not forgotten and served to keep alive the memory of its former ownership; and in later days, when this northern part of Picenum was referred to, it was sometimes designated as the one-time Gallic territory of Picenum, to distinguish it from the rest of that region. I do not know any passages in ancient authors where it is spoken of plumply as Ager Gallicus, without distinct accompanying reference to the rest of Picenum. This ager Gallicus was not a geographical proper name, and Gallia would certainly not suggest to a Roman of 43 B.C. the Picentine territory. I venture to say it would not suggest it to an American of 1920 A.D., unless he felt he could not afford to give up the identification of *Sabinus mulio* with Ventidius. The Gallia of *Catal*. x was *lutosa Gallia* and it lay in the neighborhood of Cremona-Brixia-Mantua. In that region and that region only *Sabinus mulio* declares that he was born and bred and had always lived. The northern part of Picenum was not even *lutosa;* still less was it *Gallia*. It appears to me simply absurd to suppose that the author of *Catal*. x, if he wrote to satirize Ventidius, would so insistently locate the birthplace and unvarying habitat of his *mulio* a couple of hundred miles away from the cradle of Ventidius, and much farther yet from the scenes of his widely separated activities. And it should be remembered that there is not one jot or tittle of evidence even that *Catal*. x was

written in or during its earlier years circulated in Rome, where Ventidius was presumably well known. Mr. DeWitt's remark about portents, which Mr. Frank applauds, is apparently based on the curious assumption that no interpretation of *Catal.* x is reasonably possible that does not regard *Sabinus mulio* as actually a curule magistrate at Rome! The mischief is of course that these followers of Victorius (for the identification is not Bücheler's own, as Mr. Frank calls it) are caught by the mere coincidence with *Sabinus mulio* of the *mulio* nickname of Ventidius, and accordingly insist on interpreting the Catalepton skit in terms of the career of Ventidius, and not of the poem of Catullus, of which it is a palpable parody. In pursuance of that fixed idea they violently wrench all discordant elements into alleged accord and declare the resultant jangle a delightful harmony. Surely criticism ought to be conducted on more rigorous principles than this. My objections are far from being quieted. They are on the contrary more clamorous than ever.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FLORUS LUCAN AND THE EPITOMATOR OF LIVY

In the Historical Introduction to my edition of Lucan VIII, reviewed by Professor Ullman in the last number of *Classical Philology*, I had written p. xxiv. "Much of the difficulty concerning the relation of Florus' narrative to Lucan's would be removed by the assumption, to which there is no evident objection, that the *epitomator* of Livy made use of *Lucan* and that *Florus* used the *Epitome*."

Since in Mr. Ullman's quotation this passage is stultified by the omission of the "no" before "evident," the comment which he appends, "A desperate situation to call for so desperate a remedy!" is not as apt as to an uninstructed reader it might appear.

I content myself at present with correcting this error, as I have some hope that before long I may return to the general question.[1]

J. P. POSTGATE

NOTE ON PLATO *REPUBLIC* 565 A

Δῆμος δ' ἂν εἴη τρίτον γένος, ὅσοι αὐτουργοί τε καὶ ἀπράγμονες, οὐ πάνυ πολλὰ κεκτημένοι· ὃ δὴ πλεῖστόν τε καὶ κυριώτατον ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ, ὅταν περ ἀθροισθῇ.

Plato is saying that the third and chief constituent of the population of a democratic city is composed of the small proprietors who, like the husband of Euripides' *Electra*, do their own work without the aid of slaves (αὐτουργοί) and who, absorbed in their own tasks, have little leisure or inclination to

[1] Professor Ullman has also called attention to this misprint. [EDITOR.]

attend to public affairs (ἀπράγμονες). The word ἀπράγμων is for conservative Greek and Platonic feeling almost a term of praise. Cf. *Republic* 620 C. It characterizes the quiet man who is not a busybody, a litigant, or a politician looking for trouble. The liberal optimistic Pericles protests against the implications of this use of the word. Thucydides ii. 40: μόνοι γὰρ τόν τε μηδὲν τῶνδε μετέχοντα οὐκ ἀπράγμονα, ἀλλ' ἀχρεῖον νομίζομεν. Euripides' tripartite classification of the population in *Supplices* 238 ff. is very nearly that of Plato, and in his *Orestes* 920 ff. he describes a typical αὐτουργός who, though he is not called ἀπράγμων, is so in the Platonic sense, ὀλιγάκις ἄστυ κἀγορᾶς χραίνων κύκλον. Plato may have known the passage, for the striking expression ἀνεπίπληκτον ἠσκηκὼς βίον (922) seems to be echoed in *Laws* 695 B: τροφῇ ἀνεπιπλήκτῳ τραφέντας where, however, the sense is not quite the same.

Professor Rudolf von Pöhlmann (*Geschichte der sozialen Frage*, second edition, I, p. 259) finds in our passage two classes of citizens: those who live by the work of their hands (αὐτουργοί) and the workless—that is the unemployed (ἀπράγμονες): "In der auf ein geringes Einkommen angewiesenen Masse, welche nach Plato in den Demokratien die Mehrzahl der Bevölkerung bildet, werden von ihm zwei Hauptbestandteile unterschieden: die von ihrer Hände Arbeit Lebenden und die Arbeitslosen." The footnote quotes the passage, and the interpretation is repeated on page 322.

PAUL SHOREY

BOOK REVIEWS

Aspects, Aorists and the Classical Tripos. By JANE ELLEN HARRISON.
Cambridge: The University Press, 1919. 2s. 6d.

Miss Jane Harrison, like many others, has been dabbling in the study of Russian and hastens to tell the world of her new passion and the ineffable things that she has discovered in the aspects of the Russian verb. It appears that there are two chief aspects, the imperfective and the perfective. It is the indeterminateness of the imperfective that expands the hedonistic consciousness of Miss Harrison when her temperament revolts against the austere intellectual yoke of Greek precision—the relative precision of the Greek of *Themis* and the *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* The imperfective, if I apprehend her thought, is that συγκεχυμένον τι which Plato wished mathematics and dialectic to clarify. The imperfective is the holophrastic New Caledonian or Fuegian as President Stanley Hall would and Miss Harrison does say. It expresses the philosophy of Bergson, the *durée* and the integral action in which by an interesting coincidence another admirer of Bergson, Georges Sorel, in his "Reflections on Violence" discovers the justification of direct action. The imperfective is the Russian soul, the wonderful incalculable, Tolstoian, peasant, and Bolshevist soul, so much more fascinating in its unexpectedness than the stodgy inhibited Briton whose "morality is the vice of the perfective." The imperfective is Oblomov breakfasting in his dressing-gown at eleven-thirty, marrying his landlady, and drinking himself into premature apoplexy. The coming of spring portrayed as pure seething process and imperfective aspect has power in a Russian ballad to stay a murderer's uplifted hand. The coldly finished, intellectual second aorist of ἦλθ', ἦλθε χελιδών has no such magic potency. We still, of course, need something of Greek precision and definiteness in our young lives. But if the Cambridge tripos would only combine it with Russian, then temperament and reason would wed in ideal union, and culture could chant its *nunc dimittis* in Verlaine's *Chanson grise*—or should it be *grisée?*

> où l' Indécis au Précis se joint.

PAUL SHOREY

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Vols. I and II. New York: University Press Association, 1917 and 1918.

With these two sumptuous volumes begins the new series of the *Memoirs of the American Academy,* continuing the *Supplementary Papers of the American School of Classical Studies* (Vol. I, 1905; Vol. II, 1908), but with

302

the wider range necessitated by the inclusion of the work of the School of Fine Arts. They are folios, and both stock and typography are marked by a quality that is becoming very rare in these days of paper shortage and high cost of printing. But what contributes most to the physical excellence of the volumes is the amazing effectiveness of the illustrations.

The first volume contains two long articles: one on "The Vatican Livy and the Script of Tours" (by E. K. Rand and George Howe) and the other on "The Military Indebtedness of Early Rome to Etruria" (by Eugene S. McCartney); and several shorter contributions: "The Reorganization of the Roman Priesthoods at the Beginning of the Republic," by the late Jesse B. Carter; "The Aqua Traiana and the Mills on the Janiculum," by A. W. Van Buren and G. P. Stevens; "Ancient Granulated Jewelry of the Seventh Century B.C. and Earlier," by C. Densmore Curtis; "Bartolomeo Caporali," by Stanley Lothrop; and "Capita Desecta and Marble Coiffures," by J. R. Crawford.

The article on the Vatican Livy by Rand and Howe is the second important contribution on this manuscript made by the American School. F. W. Shipley made a careful study of it when he was a fellow of the School, and published a series of articles in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (VII, 13–25, 157–97, and 405–28). The authors of the present article dissent from Shipley's view that the script of the manuscript is "one of the best examples of the calligraphy of Tours." They believe that it is early, and

if the Bamberg Bible was done under Alcuin, then the Livy must have appeared before the coming of Alcuin to Tours. One might suppose that the Livy, as the external testimony apparently indicates, was done under Fridugisus, perhaps soon after 804, while the series of which the Bamberg Bible was the first member started, say, a decade later.

In his interesting article, "Capita Desecta and Marble Coiffures," J. R. Crawford demonstrates the flimsiness of the evidence on which Gauckler based his theory that the explanation of the segmented heads, seen in so many museums, is to be found in a rite of anointing connected with cult statues of Syrian divinities whose worship had been introduced into Rome. Gauckler's hypothesis is that if the statue was already made the head was formally cut, the oil applied, and the segment mortised on again. If it was made new for the purpose, the head and its segment (or coiffure) were prepared separately. Crawford shows that the marble coiffures are wholly distinct from the segmented heads and should not be included with them. As regards the latter, he is of the opinion that they may continue to be explained on technical grounds and that Greek and Roman sculptors may have been more ready than is generally admitted to use more than a single block in the making of a marble head.

In his treatment of Rome's military indebtedness to Etruria, E. S. McCartney discusses in detail the spear, sword, shield, helmet, cuirass,

greaves, and cinctura.   He deals also with the organization of the legion,
musical instruments, standards, chariot, castra, and cavalry.   He concludes
that

whatever were the modifications suggested by encounters with the Sabines,
Samnites, Gauls, Iberians and other nations and however resourceful were the
fertile brains of Camillus, Marius and Caesar, one may rest assured that the
most important of the many stages of Rome's military evolution was Etruscan.
It is not surprising that the similarity, and, in many cases, the identity of cus-
toms and institutions gave rise to the story that Rome itself was an Etruscan
city (Dion. Hal. 1. 29. 2).   Greece was not the only nation that led her
captor captive.

But the chief value of the article is not in any novelty in the conclusion but
in the detailed presentation of the evidence on each phase of the question.

At the beginning of the second volume is a series of fifteen plates repro-
ducing the work of the Fellows of the School of Fine Arts.   A similar selec-
tion is to be presented in each issue of the *Memoirs*.   Among these we find
a capital of the "Temple of Mars Ultor in Rome" (drawn and rendered by
Walter L. Ward, fellow in architecture, 1913–16, and measured by Kenneth
E. Carpenter, fellow in architecture, 1912–15); "Restoration of the Circu-
lar Pavilion at Hadrian's Villa" (by Philip T. Shutze, fellow in architecture,
1915–18); "Villa Gamberaia": planting plan, principal elevation and side
elevation (by Edward G. Lawson, landscape architect, 1915–18); and other
contributions by the fellows in sculpture and painting.   These plates give
an excellent idea of the range of the work carried on in the Academy and
the high degree of technical skill attained by the students.

The rest of the volume is taken up with articles.   E.   Douglas Van
Buren writes on "Terracotta Arulae" (pp. 15–54); Lucy George Roberts
on "The Gallic Fire and Roman Archives" (pp. 55–66); A. W. Van Buren
on "Studies in the Archaeology of the Forum at Pompeii"; and Stanley
Lothrop on "Pietro Cavallini" (pp. 77–98).

Mrs. Van Buren's article is a distinct contribution to a subject in regard
to which our information up to this time has been somewhat vague.   She
sums up her conclusions as follows (p. 50):

These arulae originate with the Greek colonies; they are not found however
on the Greek mainland, and must therefore reveal a usage and, possibly, a cult
either purely local or brought from somewhere other than the mother country
of the settlers.   The subjects represented are schemes common to oriental art,
and here the Loryma basis comes to our assistance: for it shows that precisely
on an altar basis just such subjects were treated.   Presumably, then, the Greek
colonists knew of the use of sculptured altars as tomb monuments in Asia Minor
at any rate, if not in Greece proper, and in their new homes they perpetuated
this form of memorial, but in miniature, depositing it *within* instead of *upon* the
tomb.   Although this was the original purpose of the arulae, it is easily con-
ceivable that they were soon also dedicated as ex-votos in sanctuaries, or even

employed in houses for commemorative or domestic cults, which would account for their presence in temples and dwelling houses.

The custom must have been carried north by the colonists, for after a long tract of territory where arulae are not found, they appear again in the Greek settlement of Capua and then in Rome and the neighborhood, including Caere and Ardea, both traditional Greek foundations.

Miss Roberts' paper is a study of the evidence available for determining the extent of the Gallic fire in 387 B.C. As a result of her investigation it seems probable that almost all the international documents deposited in the Capitoline and other temples were saved. Of the other records, the *leges* in the temple of Saturn probably survived, as well as the *senatus consulta*. The pontifical records and the Laws of the Twelve Tables apparently perished. All the latter and many of the former were restored from memory.

A. W. Van Buren's article on the Pompeian Forum (like his treatment of the Aqua Traiana in Vol. I) shows that command of his subject which we have long since learned to expect from him. For many years his articles have been *magna pars* of the scholarly output of the School of Classical Studies.

Stanley Lothrop's article is a systematic study of Pietro Cavallini's career. It is elaborately and effectively illustrated.

It is to be hoped that the Academy will be able to carry out its plan of publishing a volume of this series each year. The Classical School in particular has suffered severely in the past from the lack of a medium for the publication of the important work which it is doing.

G. J. Laing

University of Chicago

M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Tertius. Recensuit et enarravit A. E. Housman. London: Richards, 1916. Pp. xxx+72.

Housman's edition of Book III of Manilius is a continuation of his editions of Books I and II (1903, 1912; the latter was reviewed by Professor E. T. Merrill in *Classical Philology*, IX [1914], 210). A first glance reveals that it is a continuation, for the Introduction begins abruptly without a heading immediately after the title-page and jumps at once into an explanation of some of the technical parts of the book. So sudden is the plunge that at first one feels that a page must be missing.

Like all of Housman's work, this edition contains the usual number of scintillating remarks upon which the members of the Housman cult may seize with avidity—and nearly everyone who has once read anything by the scholar-poet becomes at once a devotee. But not even Housman's satire is sufficient, apparently, to interest American readers in Manilius. His subject-matter is difficult and to most of us dull. Manilius is anything but easy and entertaining, though Housman calls him facile and frivolous. In England, on the contrary, Manilius, because of his very difficulty, perhaps, has attracted the attention of many scholars.

A few passages from Housman's Introduction will bear quotation here: "Liars need not have long memories if they address themselves only to fools, who have short ones; and an astrological poet writing his third book may safely forget his second, because an astrological reader will never remember it." Again in the discussion of an impossible interpretation: "The 12 athla, in not unnatural consternation, have hereupon abandoned the order which Manilius in verse 168 declares to be immutable, and are chasing each other round the circle hind-before. No stranger night-scene was ever witnessed by Walrus or by Carpenter." Manilius is apostrophized in these words: "Alas, alas! This alternative method of yours, my poor Marcus, is none other than the vulgar method which in 218–24 you said you knew, and which in 225–46 you exposed as false. The wolf, to whom in his proper shape you denied admittance, has come back disguised as your mother the goose, and her gosling has opened the door to him." Behind this brilliant exterior there is Housman's usual profound scholarship. It is this which causes his often intolerant contempt for inaccuracy on the part of the author whose work he expounds and on the part of modern interpreters. Several new and convincing interpretations offered in the Introduction are so clearly put that one wonders how scholars failed to see the truth before.

The commentary is in a way a return to eighteenth-century methods, in that it combines critical apparatus with interpretative material, all in Latin, though the Introduction is in English. The variant readings are, however, put first and printed in bold face, so that it is easy to pick them out. As in Book II, Housman depends on manuscripts GLM and on the corrector of L (L²). The names of Scaliger and Bentley are those which are most frequently attached to emendations accepted in the text, for these two are among the few scholars for whom Housman has any respect. Of the former he says in the Introduction: "Scaliger knew, but forgot to say, and consequently no other commentator knows." What a contemptuous fling at the commentators of Manilius! It makes one glad that he is not one of them. The editor's own emendations are indicated by a modest asterisk, instead of the more usual and rather conceited *ego*. Most of these had been propounded in an appendix to the edition of Book I.

The book deserves welcome from those who wish all the light they can get on the obscurities of Manilius.

B. L. Ullman

University of Iowa

_____

Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit Fridericus Vollmer. Vol. V, *Dracontius.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. Pp. x+268.

Baehrens discovered many important manuscripts and made many valuable contributions to Latin scholarship, but he was very free with his emendations and worked with such rapidity that his output was ful

of errors. Most of his work, therefore, has been in need of revision. His *Poetae Latini Minores* is no exception. The careful scholarship of Vollmer is just what was required for a revision of Baehrens' work. The fifth volume is in reality not a revision but an entirely new work, and there is no reason for retaining Baehrens' name on the title-page as far as this volume is concerned. The edition is indeed not altogether new in its present form, as it is an abridgment of Vollmer's Dracontius in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, published in 1905. One-third of Baehrens' edition contained works of Dracontius. The new edition contains Dracontius only, including the Christian poems, which, following the original plan of the work, were omitted in the first edition. Two short poems which were included by Baehrens and whose Dracontian authorship is based on mere guess are omitted in the new edition. The somewhat doubtful *De aegritudine Perdicae* is included.

The first ten poems of the *Carmina Profana* of Baehrens are now entitled *Romulea*. This name is found in the Verona *Florilegium*, a source not used by Baehrens. A very interesting paleographical fact about the *Romulea* is that the single extant manuscript contains two copies of poem X on separate quires, one of which, according to Vollmer, is part of the original from which the entire manuscript was copied. This shows in an interesting way how the quires of a manuscript were separated for copying purposes. Vollmer's terminology is unsatisfactory and confusing at this point, though, to be sure, he is merely following Baehrens: he calls the manuscript as a whole N, but in the repeated portion he calls the original N and the copy n. On the page explaining the *sigla* of the manuscript it is disturbing to see, in the midst of the Latin discussion, such forms as *Brüssel, Neapel, Mailand*.

The text differs considerably from that of Baehrens. Many of the latter's conjectures are rejected in favor of those of Duhn, the first editor of the complete *Romulea*, or of the manuscript readings.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires. By A. E. R. BOAK. (University of Michigan Studies.) Macmillan, 1919. Pp. x+160.

An adequate constitutional history of the Roman Empire has yet to be written. Mommsen, in his *Staatsrecht*, has assembled with painstaking care the materials for the study of the principate; and Seeck and others have given us admirable general descriptions of the oriental monarchy of the fourth and succeeding centuries. But there is no detailed study of the transition from the one to the other. The ordinary student is left with the

impression that Diocletian's reorganization of the empire had no bases in precedent.   Moreover, most books upon the imperial constitution are marred by one fault.   Chronology is largely ignored.   Documents of one century are freely combined with documents of a century earlier or later, and the result is at best a *Gesamtanschauung* of the imperial system in which the evolution and decay of institutions are obscured.   Some day, it is to be hoped, we shall have a much clearer view than is now available of the supersession of the republican institutions of Rome by the direct administration of the princeps, of the destruction of municipal self-government through the interference of imperial officials, and of the various effects—for the most part malign—of the disappearance of the very idea of political freedom in the ancient world.   Before such a book can be written, however, there will be needed a host of special studies.

Professor Boak's book on *The Master of the Offices* is such a study. Karlowa, Schiller, and the *Cambridge Medieval History* in their surveys of the empire in the fourth century describe in general terms the functions of the master of the offices at the height of his power.   Seeck (in *Pauly-Wissowa*, IV, 633, 644 f.) has studied the origin of the master's office.   Mommsen, in his *Ostgothischen Studien*, has set forth the rôle of the mastership in the Gothic kingdom of Italy and the Eastern Empire about 600 A.D.   The later history of the mastership is told by Bury in his *Imperial Administration in the Ninth Century*.   What Professor Boak now aims to supply is "a complete history of the mastership that will cover the whole period of its existence and trace clearly, so far as possible, in their proper chronological order, the various stages of its development and decline, showing the connection between these stages and the general tendencies which affected the administration as a whole" (pp. 3–4).   He has performed his task admirably. The study is fully documented.   There is a good bibliography and index. In Appendix A a list of the known Masters of the Offices to 700 A.D. is given.   Students of the earlier periods of Roman history will be interested in the chapter which Professor Boak prefixes to his main study, on the Roman *Magistri* in general, and in the list of references to the title "magister" in inscriptions and literature which is given in Appendix A.

DONALD McFAYDEN

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA